

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1315497

BS  
2595  
L85



The Library  
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY  
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE  
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA





How Luke was written

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

C. F. CLAY, MANAGER

London: FETTER LANE, E.C.

Edinburgh: 100 PRINCES STREET



New York: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS

Bombay, Calcutta and Madras: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.

Toronto: J. M. DENT AND SONS, LTD.

Tokyo: THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA

*All rights reserved*



# How Luke was written

(Considerations affecting the Two-Document Theory with  
special reference to the Phenomena of Order in the  
Non-Marcian Matter common to Matthew and Luke)

BY

E. W. LUMMIS, M.A.

OF KING'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,  
FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF WORCESTER COLLEGE, OXFORD

Edward William Lummis

1867-

Cambridge:  
at the University Press

1915

Theology Library  
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY  
AT CLAREMONT  
California

JOSEPHO ESTLIN CARPENTER  
S.T.P.  
VIRO DOCTISSIMO GRAVISSIMO AMICISSIMO  
D.D.  
EDVARDUS GULIELMUS LUMMIS

16-3932



## PREFACE

THE dominance of the Two-document Theory is to be explained historically. Ferdinand Christian Baur of Tübingen was concerned to prove that Mark was the latest of the Gospels, and the chief internal evidence which he could adduce was that of apparent conflation in certain passages (e.g. Mk 11, 2, 3) of the text of Matthew and that of Luke. Thus attention was directed at the very beginning of modern scientific criticism to a particular grouping of the Synoptic Gospels, that in which Mark alone stands over against Matthew and Luke in association.

Critics who did not belong to the Tübingen school soon perceived that the phenomena indicated by F. C. Baur could be more naturally explained by regarding Mark as a source for both Matthew and Luke than as a conflation of the two sources, viz. Matthew and Luke. In this theory, which still holds the field (subject to the question of an Ur-marcus), Matthew and Luke are still associated, Mark still stands alone on the opposite side of the relation asserted; instead of drawing upon Mt. and Lk., Mark now gives to both Mt. and Lk. The great advantage of this view was that it accounted not only for the apparent conflations in Mark, but also for the occurrence *in both Mt. and Lk.* of words, phrases, even

clauses, which are also in Mark. It was most natural that the next question to arise should be, How are we to account for the occurrence *in both Mt. and Lk.* of words and passages which do *not* occur in Mark? It was equally natural that the first hasty answer should be, *Mt. and Lk.* must have had a second common source, besides Mark. Weisse found that desideratum in Schleiermacher's *Matthæan Logia*, and the Two-Source Theory was launched on its proud career.

In criticism, no less than in natural science, the kind of answer which you get depends upon the kind of question that you put. In the investigation of the non-Markan coincidences of Matthew and Luke I submit that, through causes which are perspicuous and intelligible, the wrong question was put. From the first, one term in the Synoptic problem had been Mark, the other term *Mt. + Lk.* The manipulation of these terms in research concerning the Triple Tradition had recently issued in a striking success. Another problem, apparently a similar problem, had now to be faced. Coincidences in Matthew and Luke had again to be accounted for. What more natural than to operate with the same arrangement of terms as before? Mark is, in the nature of the case, eliminated. *Mt. + Lk.* remains. This term must now be related to some second term. The question was put, To what second term can we relate it?

But this second problem was not really similar to the first. The first was concerned with a Triple Tradition. The second had to do with a Double Tradition. In the first problem there were three data, Mark, Luke and Matthew, and it was clear that the relation of Mark to Matthew resembled the relation of Mark to Luke. Here the setting

of Mark on one side, and of Mt. + Lk. on the other side, was a step suggested by the subject matter itself. Then the question of priority, on one side or the other, remained to be settled. But in the second problem there were only two terms, Matthew and Luke. The right question to ask was, in true logic, Can we trace dependence of Matthew on Luke, or of Luke on Matthew? No hypothetical, extrinsic third term should have been called in to help in the solution of this problem until it was clear that, without such help, no solution could be reached. The right question has indeed been put, and answered in various senses, but always under the shadow of the towering authority of Q<sup>1</sup>. The thesis which I support in this work is that Q, as a hypothetical document which was a common source for Matthew and Luke, is unnecessary. Not only so; it is excluded. I submit evidence for the view that the phenomena of the non-Marcan coincidences of Matthew and Luke can be explained *only* on the assumption that Luke was acquainted with Matthew, and that he derived his knowledge of the common matter, with slight exceptions, if any, directly from Matthew, and from Matthew alone.

E. W. L.

May, 1915.

<sup>1</sup> The coincidences of Lk. and Mt. in *Marcan* matter have induced a few critics to admit some degree of dependence of Lk. on Mt. : Simons, Jacobsen, Holtzmann, Stockmeyer, Wendt, Soltau, Fr. Spitta; all of these except Jacobsen and Spitta recognise also a common Q for Mt. and Lk.

# CONTENTS

CHAP.	PAGE
I. NON-MARCAN PIECES COMMON TO MATTHEW AND LUKE . . . . .	1
§ 1. Phenomena of Order . . . . .	1
§ 2. The Q hypothesis . . . . .	17
II. MATTHEW A SOURCE OF LUKE . . . . .	34
§ 1. The disposition of Matthaean matter in Luke . . . . .	34
§ 2. Luke's καθ'ἑξῆς principle . . . . .	39
§ 3. Luke <sub>m</sub> and Codex D . . . . .	40
§ 4. Considerations preliminary to Chapter III . . . . .	45
III. THE COMPOSITION OF LUKE <sub>m</sub> (UP TO THE GREAT OMISSION) . . . . .	51
§ 1. Work on Mark and Matthew . . . . .	51
§ 2. Work on Mark alone (with touches derived from the summary in Matthew) . . . . .	58
§ 3. Work on Matthew alone . . . . .	64
§ 4. Work on Mark and Matthew . . . . .	102
IV. THE INSERTION OF LUKE'S PECULIAR MATTER AT THE REVISION . . . . .	112
CONCLUSION . . . . .	114
APPENDIX I. COMPARISON OF A- AND B-PIECES IN LUKE . . . . .	116
APPENDIX II. LUKE'S USE OF THE PERIPHRASTIC IMPERFECT . . . . .	131

## CHAPTER I

### NON-MARCAN PIECES COMMON TO MATTHEW AND LUKE

#### § 1. **Phenomena of Order.**

The two presentments of the so-called Logian matter (non-Markan passages common to Matthew and Luke) exhibit certain very striking phenomena of agreement in point of order. The nature of this agreement, and consequently its extent, seems never to have been fully recognised,—not even by Dr Harnack, who, in his *Sayings of Jesus*, comes nearest to a true perception, but misses the key to the problem of Luke's arrangement.

Sir John Hawkins (*Horae Synopticae*, p. 88) gives a list of seventy-two passages of Logian matter (varying in length from one verse to nine) and remarks that "49, or more than two-thirds of them, are placed differently in the two gospels<sup>1</sup>." The author does not explain his phrase "placed differently," and it is hard to make out exactly what is meant by it; but his comment gives a reader the quite erroneous impression that less than a third of this matter shows any agreement in order in Mt. and Lk. Dr Arthur Wright, again (*Synopsis*, v. 1), says that "S. Luke's arrangement of the *Logia*, except in a

<sup>1</sup> Again in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, p. 120: "62 out of 84 are differently placed by Mt. and Lk."

few cases where S. Mark gives him a clue, is entirely different from S. Matthew's. Even where, as in the Sermon on the Mount, the Temptation, the Queen of the South, and the Woes on the Pharisees, S. Luke agrees with S. Matthew in bringing certain clauses together, he does not arrange them in the same order." Dr Wright concludes "that both he and S. Matthew received the *Logia* of which these sections are composed, in a state of chaos, their *disiecta membra* being widely scattered over the Source. The two Evangelists then collected together such Sayings as obviously dealt with the same subject and finally arranged them, each according to his own notions of what was best." The phenomena of order in this Matthaео-Lucan matter are however quite incapable of this interpretation. This will appear clearly when they are displayed.

Since the appearance of Harnack's *Sprüche* critics no longer speak quite so unguardedly on this matter. Canon Streeter, for instance, in *Oxford Studies of the Synoptic Problem*, p. 143, writes that "on closer examination we can detect behind the great variety of order a certain original unity of arrangement." Nevertheless the particular facts to which I shall draw attention have not been perceived; and the reason why they have remained concealed is easy to understand. It is stated by Professor Stanton (*The Gospels as Historic Documents*, Pt II. p. 29) as follows:

"Our third evangelist was not to any considerable extent dependent upon the first (or the first upon the third) for the common contents of their Gospels.

"Hardly anyone will, I believe, at the present day [1909] dissent from this statement."



In the *Oxford Studies* the only dissentients from the usual form of the Two-Document hypothesis are Archdeacon Allen and Dr Bartlett; Dr Bartlett's theory differs from that of Canon Streeter only in the point that an *oral* Q is posited; and Archdeacon Allen's only in the point that he regards Luke's dependence on Q as mediate, while Matthew's was immediate. The scholars of Germany and America are, almost without exception, at one with their colleagues in Oxford and Cambridge in holding that, wherever else you may seek for a solution of the problem of Luke's arrangement of the *Logia*, you are not to seek it in the text of Matthew. It is however only in Matthew that the new facts concerning Luke's order can be discovered: and I suggest in this essay that the readiest, simplest and most fruitful explanation of those facts lies in a hypothesis of direct dependence of Luke on Matthew for the common non-Marcan matter. ✓

During the examination of the arrangement of the Logian matter in Mt. and Lk. two considerations should be held in mind:

(1) It is argued that (a) the community of the Matthaean and Lucan sections of the Double Tradition in point of *matter* points to a common source, and (b) their divergence in point of *order* implies that this was an extrinsic source, not one of the two gospels in question. Just so far as the independence of Mt. and Lk. in point of order is shown to be illusory the force of the second inference will fail, while the first will still hold good. The Two-Source theory cannot be adequately defended by carrying back the agreement in order of Mt. and Lk. to the hypothetical source itself, since the hypothesis of an extrinsic source, so far as it is concerned with order,



depends on *disagreement* in order between the two gospels. Other reasons, independent and separately sufficient, must, in the case supposed, be advanced for assuming a Logia-source Q.

(2) Agreement in order, extensive enough to exclude mere coincidence, is a much stronger argument for community than disagreement in order against community. The inference: "Lk. departs from the order of Mt.; therefore he cannot have known Mt." implies the major premiss "No writer who uses a document ever for any reason rearranges the matter which he borrows"; and this is plainly false. On the other hand the difference in order is by no means insignificant, and must not be ignored. No dependence-theory, for instance, can be considered satisfactory unless it either accounts for the order in the dependent gospel or at least discloses some reason for the disturbance of order, and indicates some principle of arrangement in the secondary document.

Here follows a table of the Matthaean matter in Lk. :

Lk. 3, 7-9	= Mt. 3, 7-10	Lk. 6, 43, 44	= Mt. 7, 16-18 + 12, 33
" 17	= " 12	" 45	= " 12, 35, 34b
" 4, 2b-13a	= " 4, 2-11	" 46	= " 7, 21
" 6, 20, 21	= " 5, 3, 4, 6	" 47-49	= " 24-27
" 22, 23	= " 11, 12	" 7, 1a	= " 28a
" 27, 28	= " 44	" 1b-10	= " 8, 5-10, 13
" 29	= " 39b, 40	" 18-28	= " 11, 2-11
" 30	= " 42	" 31-35	= " 16-19
" 31	= " 7, 12	" 9, 2	= " 10, 7
" 32	= " 5, 46	" 57-60	= " 8, 19-22
" 35b	= " 45	" 10, 2	= " 9, 37, 38
" 36	= " 48	" 3	= " 10, 16a
" 37a	= " 7, 1	" 4a	= " 9, 10a
" 38b	= " 2b	" 5, 6	= " 12, 13
" 39b	= " 15, 14b	" 7a(1)	= " 11a(1)
" 40	= " 10, 24, 25a	" 7b	= " 10b
" 41, 42	= " 7, 3-5	" 8a	= " 11a(2)

Lk. 10, 9 $\alpha$	= Mt. 10, 8	Lk. 12, 33 $\delta$ , 34	= Mt. 6, 20, 21
" 9 $\delta$	= " 7	" 39, 40	= " 24, 43, 44
" 10, 11	= " (11), 14, 7	" 42-46	= " 45-51 $\alpha$
" 12	= " 15 + 11, 24	" 51-53	= " 10, 34-36
" 13-15	= " 11, 21-23	" 58, 59	= " 5, 25, 26
" 16	= " 10, 40	" 13, 20, 21	= " 13, 33
" 21, 22	= " 11, 25-27	" 24	= " 7, 13, 14
" 23, 24	= " 13, 16, 17	" 25-27	= " 22, 23
" 25	= " 22, 35 $\alpha$	" 28, 29	= " 8, 11, 12
" 11, 2-4	= " 6, 9, 10 $\alpha$ , 11, 12, 13 $\alpha$	" 34, 35	= " 23, 37-39
" 9-11	= " 7, 7-10	" 14, 3 $\delta$	= " 12, 10 $\delta$
" 13	= " 11	" 5	= " 11
" 14	= " 9, 32, 33 $\alpha$ + 12, 22, 23	" 11	= " 23, 12
" 15	= " 34 + 12, 24	" 23	= " 22, 9
" 16	= " 12, 38	" 26, 27	= " 10, 37, 38
" 17-23	= " 25-30	" 34, 35	= " 5, 13
" 24-26	= " 43-45	" 15, 4, 5, 7	= " 18, 12, 13
" 29-32	= " 39, 41, 42	" 16, 13	= " 6, 24
" 1 34, 35	= " 6, 22, 23	" 16	= " 11, 12, 13
" 39	= " 23, 25	" 17	= " 5, 18
" 42	= " 23	" 17, 1	= " 18, 7
" 44	= " 27	" 3, 4	= " 15 $\alpha$ , 21, 22
" 46 $\delta$	= " 4	" 6	= " 17, 20 $\delta$
" 47, 48	= " 29-31	" 23, 24	= " 24, 26, 27
" 49-51	= " 34-36	" 26, 27	= " 37-39 $\alpha$
" 52	= " 13	" 30	= " 39 $\delta$
" 12, 2	= " 10, 26	" 34, 35	= " 40, 41
" 3-9	= " 27-33	" 37 $\delta$	= " 28
" 10	= " 12, 32	" 19, 20-26	= " 25, 24-29
" 22-31	= " 6, 25-33	" 22, 28-30	= " 19, 28 $\delta$

The above list differs from Hawkins' Logia-list in that it excludes Mt. 16, 2, 3 (double-bracketed by WH) and Mt. 21, 44 (bracketed by WH), and also Mt. 5, 47, the inclusion of which by Hawkins seems to be a mere slip; and in the inclusion of certain verses omitted by Hawkins: Mt. 9, 32, 33  $\alpha$ , 34; 12, 22-26, 29, for Lk. 11, 14, 15 is obviously

<sup>1</sup> Lk. 11, 33 = Mt. 5, 15; but since the proof of this depends on a theory which is not, at this point, established, the verse has been omitted from this list. (Cf. p. 93.)

akin to Mt. 9, 32-34, of which Mt. 12, 22-24 is clearly an enhanced doublet; that this was also Lk.'s view is shown by his substitution of the earlier and simpler version in this passage; in the discourse which follows, the community between Mt. and Lk. is not obscured by the fact that a discourse in Mk 3 discloses a minor degree of community with both, and since Mt. and Lk. agree over a whole series of verses it seems perverse to assign a direct Marcan origin to a verse here and there in the series in Lk.—Mt. 12, 32 = Lk. 12, 10, and there is no reference in Mk to the Son of Man.—Lk. 6, 45 clearly corresponds to Mt. 12, 35, 34*b*, and obviously in sequence to the δένδρον καλόν and δένδρον σαπρόν of Mt. 12, 33, identified by Lk. with Mt. 7, 18.—Whatever may be said of the two parables as a whole, Lk. 14, 23 is plainly identical with Mt. 22, 9.—The words νομικός and [ἐκ]πειράζων αὐτόν betray community between Mt. 22, 35*a* and Lk. 10, 25.—In a note Hawkins doubtfully identifies Lk. 19, 26 with Mt. 25, 29: but the community clearly extends back as far as Mt. 25, 24.

The list given above comprises 215 Matthaean verses.

If we follow the order in which these verses appear in Lk. we observe that up to a certain point (Mt. 5, 12; Lk. 6, 23) they maintain their Matthaean order exactly. [Not, of course, that immediately consecutive verses in Mt. are always immediately consecutive in Lk. Mt. 5, 5, 7-10 are omitted, and Lk. 6, 20-23 = Mt. 5, 3, 4, 6, 11, 12. But the Matthaean verses which do appear in Lk. appear in their Matthaean order.] The insertion of Mt. 5, 44 at this point departs from the *exact* Matthaean order, and the appearance of Mt. 7, 12 at Lk. 6, 31 is a sheer dislocation

of the order in Mt. Later in Lk. we find what looks like an utter ignorance or neglect of the Matthaean arrangement; passages from Mt. 6, 24, 10, 5, 13 and 7 appear close together in this order, interspersed with Marco-Matthaean passages and Lucan matter. If however we leave on one side these interruptions and confusions, and keep our eye on the positive phenomenon, namely the Matthaean sequence running through Lk., we observe a very striking fact.

The following series of Matthaean verses, in their EXACT Matthaean order, runs through Lk.:

Mt. 3, 7-10. 12. 4, 2-11. 5, 3, 4, 11, 12. 39*b*, 40, 42. 45, 48. 7, 1, 2*b*. 3-5. 16-18. 21, 24-28*a*. 8, 5-10, 13. 19-22. 9, 37, 38. 10, 9, 10*a*. 12, 13. 14. 15. 11, 21-23. 25-27. 12, 22-24. 25-30. 39, 41, 42. 23, 25. 27. 29-31, 34-36. 24, 43, 44. 45-51*a*. 25, 24-29.

This series includes ninety-eight verses. That is to say,  $\frac{98}{215}$ , or more than  $\frac{6}{13}$  and almost  $\frac{7}{15}$  of the Matthaean verses in Lk. appear in Lk. in their *exact* Matthaean order.

Moreover, it would be artificial and unscientific to insist that only verses which follow their exact Matthaean sequence are significant of a community in point of order between Mt. and Lk. It can hardly be by accident that Mt. 5, 44 appears in Lk. immediately before Mt. 5, 39*b*, 40, 42; we are justified in equating Lk. 6, 27-30 with Mt. 5, 44, 39*b*, 40, 42—that is to say with Mt. 5, 39-44, from which Lk. has made omissions (or to which Mt. has added). Again, when Mt. 5, 46 appears in the list just before Mt. 5, 45, 48, we have evidently to do with Mt. 5, 45-48 (47 being an omission of Lk. or an addition of Mt.). We must not, of course, count Mt. 5, 41 and 47 as if they actually appeared in Lk., but we may count Mt. 5, 44, 39*b*, 40, 42, 46, 45, 48 as seven verses which substantially agree,

in Lk., with the Matthaean order. (They all come from the double section Mt. 5, 38-48 which deals with behaviour towards oppressors.) Similarly when we find Mt. 10, 7-16*a* in Lk. 10, 3-12, the significance of this fact is not reduced by the arrangement of the verses thus: Mt. 10, 16*a*, 9, 10*a*, 12, 13, 11(1), 10*b*, 11(2), 7, (11)14, 7, 15. We must here count not merely six verses, but ten, as exhibiting substantially a Matthaean order. Once more, when Lk. made use of the successive Matthaean verses 10, 7-16*a* (as above), 40; 11, 21-27, it was inevitable that he should perceive the substantial identity of 10, 15 (the last verse in his arrangement of 10, 7-16*a*) and 11, 24, and natural enough that he should therefore add the remainder of the passage 11, 21-27 immediately after that verse (which is, in respect of what precedes, Mt. 10, 15, and in respect of what follows, Mt. 11, 24). A place must then be found for the one remaining Matthaean verse, 10, 40, at some appropriate place before the close of the section. It is actually placed, with some enlargement which adapts it to its slightly modified situation in the context, between 11, 23 and 11, 25—that is to say, exactly where it occurs in the Matthaean order if 11, 24 is identified with 10, 15, and 11, 21-23 are therefore regarded as adhering to 10, 15. The position of Mt. 10, 40 in Lk. is not, then, in any real sense, a departure from the Matthaean order. Then again, it can hardly be by accident that we find in Lk., between Mt. 24, 43-51*a* and 25, 24-29, and appearing (in the series of Matthaean verses) immediately before 25, 24-29, these verses: Mt. 24, 26, 27, 37-41, 28. The reason why *v.* 28 has been moved to the end of this sequence is obvious: it was needed to close the section, since Mt. 24, 41 is not a possible conclusion. If we cannot quite so readily

perceive why the whole section 24, 26-41 has been placed after, instead of before, 24, 43-51*a*, yet it is clear that we are dealing with two whole, consecutive sections, which have simply been transposed in order. The departure from exact repetition of the Matthaean order in Lk. does not here obscure the community of the two gospels in point of arrangement. A similar remark applies to the slight rearrangement of verses in the two sequences in Lk. 11—one from Mt. 12, the other from Mt. 23.

We can therefore trace through Lk. the following series of Matthaean verses SUBSTANTIALLY in their Matthaean order:

Mt. 3, 7-10. 12. 4, 2-11. 5, 3, 6, 4, 11, 12. 44, 39*b*, 40, 42. 46. 45, 48. 7, 1, 2*b*. 3-5. 16-18. 21, 24-28*a*. 8, 5-10, 13. 19-22. 9, 37, 38. 10, 16*a*, 9, 10*a*. 12, 13, 11 (1), 10*b*, 11 (2). 8, 7, 14. 15 (= 11, 24), 11, 21-23, 10, 40. 11, 25-27. 12, 22-24, 38, 25-30, 43-45. 39, 41, 42. 23, 25. 23. 27. 4, 29-31, 34-36, 13. 24, 43, 44. 45-51*a*. 26, 27. 37-39*a*. 39*b*. 40, 41. 28. 25, 24-29.

These verses number 122. We have now detached a series of Matthaean verses in Lk., which in point of order exhibit community with Mt., and amount to  $\frac{122}{215}$  or very nearly four-sevenths of the whole Logian matter.

When we have disengaged this Matthaean series from the Logian matter in Lk., and contemplate the eighty-three verses that remain, an even more remarkable fact becomes apparent. A second series in Matthaean order stands clearly out, as follows:

Mt. 6, 9, 10*a*, 11, 12, 13*a*. 22, 23. 25-33. 20, 21. 7, 13, 14, 22, 23, 8, 11, 12. 12, 10*b*. 11. 18, 12, 13. 7. 15, 21, 22. 19, 28*b*.

The only verses which depart from the *exact* order in Mt. in this series are 6, 20, 21 and 18, 7. The whole number of verses is thirty-three.

The series amounts then to considerably more than one-third of that residuary Logian matter in Lk. in which it appears.

Considered with reference to the whole Logian matter, the series in *exact* Matthaean order is nearly equal to one-seventh, in substantially Matthaean order nearly equal to one-sixth.

When this second series has been eliminated, a third series, of fifteen verses, is seen to run through the fifty verses which remain :

Mt. 10, 24, 25*a*. 26-33. 34-36. 37, 38.

(The series could be formally extended to eighteen verses by the addition of Mt. 11, 12, 13 and 17, 20*b* ; but the appearance of these two fragments where they are to be found in Lk. need not in itself have any relation to the order of Mt., whereas the appearance of the whole of 10, 24-38 (except 25*b*), in separate pieces, but in the exact Matthaean order, does not seem to be accidental.)

This is three-tenths of the residual matter, or about one-fourteenth of the whole.

The number of verses which in the three several series follow the *exact* Matthaean order is 144, or two-thirds of the whole. The total number of verses in the three series is 170, which stands to 215 as 17 to 21½.

In the table on page 11 these series are exhibited not verse-wise but passage-wise (a passage being a consecutive piece of Mt. which appears without break in Lk.). Passages are separated by points.

Passages in round brackets depart from the *exact* order of verses in Mt. The number of passages is actually 102,



<i>First Series</i>	<i>Second Series</i>	<i>Third Series</i>	<i>Remainder</i>
Mt. 3, 7-10. 12. 4, 2-11. 5, 3. 6. 4. 11, 12. (44). 39 <i>b</i> , 40. 42 (5, 46), 45. 48. 7, 1. 2 <i>b</i> .		10, 24, 25 <i>a</i>	7, 12 15, 14 <i>b</i> .  12, 35, 34 <i>b</i> .  11, 2-11. 16-19. 10, 7.
7, 3-5. 16-18 [incl. 12, 33] 7, 21. 24-28 <i>a</i> . 8, 5-10. 13			
8, 19-22. 9, 37, 38. (10, 16 <i>a</i> ) 10, 9, 10 <i>a</i> . 12, 13. (11 <i>a</i> 1) (10 <i>b</i> ) (11 <i>a</i> 2) (8) (7). 14. (7) 15=11, 24. 11, 21-23. (10, 40), 11, 25-27.	6, 9, 10 <i>a</i> . 11, 12, 13 <i>a</i>		13, 16, 17. 22, 35 <i>a</i> . 7, 7-10. 11.
[9, 32, 33 <i>a</i> =] 12, 22, 23 [9, 34=] 12, 24 (12, 38), 12, 25-30 (12, 43- 45) 39. 41, 42. 23, 25. (23) 27. (4) 29-31. 34-36. (13)	6, 22, 23  6, 25-33. (20, 21).  7, 13, 14. 22, 23. 8, 11, 12 12, 10 <i>b</i> . 11.  18, 12. 13. (18, 7), 15 <i>a</i> . 21, 22  19, 28 <i>b</i>	10, 26-33  10, 34-36  10, 37, 38	5, 25, 26. 13, 33. 23, 37-39 23, 12. 22, 9. 5, 13 6, 24. 11, 12, 13. 5, 18 17, 20 <i>b</i> .
24, 43, 44. 45-51 <i>a</i>			
(24, 26, 27) (37-39 <i>a</i> ) (39 <i>b</i> ) (40, 41), (28), 25, 24-29			

but as shown above (9, 32, 33*a* and 34 being counted as two passages, and identified severally with 12, 22, 23 and 24) appears as 101<sup>1</sup>. Of these fifty-nine are in the first series, sixteen in the second, four in the third; twenty-two remain.

Of the twenty-two residual passages, one, Mt. 10, 7, appears in Lk. in the same Marcan context in which it appears in Mt.<sup>2</sup> Two others, Mt. 12, 35, 34*b*, are actually found in sequence to Mt. 12, 33, at the place where it appears earlier in Mt. as 7, 18—just as, *per contra*, 9, 32, 33*a*, 34 take the place of the cognate verses 12, 22–24 before 12, 25–30. (12, 33–35*b* are consequently omitted from the Matthaean series from Mt. 12 which occurs in Lk. 11.) Two more, consecutive sections, 11, 2–11, 16–19, are omitted from the sequence from Mt. 11 in Lk. 10, and inserted at an earlier place in Lk. But this cannot be taken as denoting ignorance or neglect of the Matthaean order, since these sections *could not possibly* have held their place in Lk. 10: they refer to the Baptist as still alive, whereas in a Marcan section standing between the two great Matthaean sequences in Lk. John has been spoken of as already dead (Lk. 9, 7, 9). For this reason, we may assume, these sections were removed from their place in the second Matthaean sequence to that in which they now stand, between the first Matthaean sequence and the Marcan section in question.

Three of the residual sections therefore, viz. Mt. 10, 7; 12, 35, 34*b*, must be included among those sections which exhibit some degree of community with Mt. in point of

<sup>1</sup> In each of these numerations Mt. 10, 7 is counted thrice, in accordance with its threefold appearance.

<sup>2</sup> It nevertheless retains its place in the Lucan discourse which corresponds to the Matthaean discourse here given (Mt. 10, Lk. 10).

order; and two more, viz. Mt. 11, 2-11, 16-19, must be excluded from those which contradict the Matthaean order.

(This kind of examination might be pressed further with similar results. For instance, Mt. 7, 7-10, 11, seems to belong to the second series, and to find its strictly correct place between 6, 25-33, 20, 21 and 7, 13, 14; but if it had for a moment held that position it might very naturally have been shifted forward over three sections of the sequence, in order to stand, where it actually does stand, immediately after the other Matthaean sections on prayer, Mt. 6, 9, 10a; 11, 12, 13a. Since however the reason for its removal is, although strong and obvious, still not imperative (as in the case of Mt. 11, 2-11, 16-19), it cannot be reckoned among objective facts, of which alone this survey takes account.)

The number of sections whose place in Lk. tells for community in point of order with Mt. is now seen to be 82, as against 17 whose place appears independent of the Matthaean order. (Even these 17, considered collectively, are not wholly without indication of community with Mt.: the average chapter-index of the first eight is 11, the odd one in the middle comes from 13, the average chapter-index of the last eight is 14. If verses, instead of passages, are considered, these number 25: the chapter-index in Mt. of the first twelve averages  $10\frac{1}{6}$ , of the last twelve  $15\frac{1}{6}$ .)

These facts may be graphically exhibited in another way. If the passages be numbered consecutively, 1-100<sup>1</sup>, in the order in which they appear, they will be denoted as follows:

<sup>1</sup> Counting the slightly separated verses Mt. 5, 3 and 4 as one passage, or omitting Mt. 5, 4 as not exactly identical with Lk. 6, 21b.

1.	Mt. 3, 7-10.	51.	Mt. 10, 34-36
2.	" 12.	52.	" 37, 38
3.	" 4, 2-11	53.	" 40
4.	" 5, 3, 4	54.	" 11, 2-11
5.	" 6	55.	" 12, 13
6.	" 11, 12	56.	" 16-19
7.	" 13	57.	" 21-23
8.	" 18	58.	" 24
9.	" 25, 26	59.	" 25-27
10.	" 39 <i>b</i> , 40	60.	" 12, 10 <i>b</i>
11.	" 42	61.	" 11
12.	" 44	62.	" 22-24
13.	" 45	63.	" 25-30
14.	" 46	64.	" 32
15.	" 48	65.	" 33
16.	" 6, 9, 10 <i>a</i>	66.	" 34 <i>b</i>
17.	" 11-13 <i>a</i>	67.	" 35
18.	" 20, 21	68.	" 38
19.	" 22, 23	69.	" 39
20.	" 24	70.	" 41, 42
21.	" 25-33	71.	" 43-45
22.	" 7, 1	72.	" 13, 16, 17
23.	" 2 <i>b</i>	73.	" 33
24.	" 3-5	74.	" 15, 14 <i>b</i>
25.	" 7-10	75.	" 17, 20 <i>b</i>
26.	" 11	76.	" 18, 7
27.	" 12	77.	" 12
28.	" 13, 14	78.	" 13
29.	" 16-18	79.	" 15 <i>a</i>
30.	" 21	80.	" 21, 22
31.	" 22, 23	81.	" 19, 28 <i>b</i>
32.	" 24-28 <i>a</i>	82.	" 22, 9
33.	" 8, 5-10	83.	" 35 <i>a</i>
34.	" 11, 12	84.	" 23, 4
35.	" 13	85.	" 12
36.	" 19-22	86.	" 13
37.	" 9, 32, 33 <i>a</i>	87.	" 23
38.	" 34	88.	" 25
39.	" 37, 38	89.	" 27
40.	" 10, 7	90.	" 29-31
41.	" 8	91.	" 34-36
42.	" 9, 10 <i>a</i>	92.	" 37-39
43.	" 10 <i>b</i>	93.	" 24, 26, 27
44.	" 11 <i>a</i>	94.	" 28
45.	" 12, 13	95.	" 37-39 <i>a</i>
46.	" 14	96.	" 39 <i>b</i>
47.	" 15	97.	" 40, 41
48.	" 16 <i>a</i>	98.	" 43, 44
49.	" 24, 25 <i>a</i>	99.	" 45-51 <i>a</i>
50.	" 26-33	100.	" 25, 24-29

Their order in Lk. is as follows:

1	2	3	4	5	6	12	10	11	27	14	13	15	22	23	74	49	24	29	=	65	67	66
30	32	33	35	54	56	40	36	39	48	42	45	44	43	44	41	40	46	40	47	=	58	57
53	59	72	83	16	17	25	26	37	+38	=62	68	63	71	69	70	19	88	87	89	84	90	
91	86	50	64	21	18	98	99	51	9	73	28	31	34	92	60	61	85	82	52	7	77	
78	20	55	8	76	79	80	75	93	95	96	97	94	100	81								

The first series stands thus:

1	2	3	4	5	6	12	10	11	14	13	15	22	23	24	29(=65	67	66)			
30	32	33	35				36	39	48	42	45	44	43	44	41	40	46	40	47=58	57
53	59							37+38=62	68	63	71	69	70	88	87	89	84	90		
91	86					98	99													

Elimination of the first series leaves:

									27							74	49				
				54	56	40															
		72	83	16	17	25	26										19				
		50	64	21	18			51	9	73	28	31	34	92	60	61	85	82	52	7	77
78	20	55	8	76	79	80	75							81							

The second series stands thus:

				16	17												19				
				21	18												60	61			77
78				76	79	80					28	31	34	81							

Elimination of the second series leaves:

									27							74	49				
				54	56	40															
		72	83			25	26														
		50	64					51	9	73				92			85	82	52	7	
		20	55	8			75														

in which the four consecutively numbered passages denoted by thick type constitute the third series.

[My own analysis of Logian matter, in respect of order, was completed in 1907, before I saw Harnack's *Sprüche*. In this work (Eng. tr., *Sayings of Jesus*, 1908, p. 178) Harnack comes to the conclusion that certain sections "permit of being arranged in an order which is practically identical in St Matthew and St Luke." Translated out of Harnack's Lucan numeration into my own, which follows Mt., these sections are :

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 12, 10, 11, 14, 13, 15, 22, 23, 24, 29, 30, 32, 33, 35, 54, 56, 36, 39, 45, 43, 47, 57, 59, 62, 63, 71, 68, 69, 70, 84, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 50, 98, 99, 51, 92, 52, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, [Mt. 10, 39], 81.

The number of these is fifty-five. One of these, Mt. 10, 39, is omitted from my examination as being a Marcan verse. Two others, sections 54 and 56, are the two passages, Mt. 11, 2-11, 16-19, which I have mentioned as probably forming part of my first series in its original order, though (since that order has been dislocated) I have not included them as belonging to it. Three more, 50, 51 and 52, belong to my third series (Harnack does not include 49, probably because he hesitated where to place it). Another, 81, is found in my second series. Harnack also includes 92, which I have not placed in any series. *The remaining forty-seven sections are all included in my first series.* The first twenty sections coincide exactly in both lists. Allowing for my identification of 29 with 65, and 37 + 38 with 62, the agreement between the two lists extends to fifty sections. The only sections included by myself and excluded by Harnack are : 48, 42, 44, 41, 40, 46 (the verses from Mt. 10 which appear together with 45, 43, 47, viz. Mt. 10, 12, 13, 10b, 15, but in a disturbed order, which Harnack did not venture to arrange), 53 (Mt. 10, 40, upon

whose position in the series I have commented above) and 100, which Harnack does not recognise as Logian, except so far as Mt. 25, 29 is concerned, which he does not place.]

## § 2. The Q Hypothesis.

How are we to interpret these facts concerning a community of order in the Logian matter of Mt. and Lk.? Harnack (op. cit. p. 178), reviewing the passages which make up substantially (as has been shown) my first series, concludes, "they therefore certainly belong to a single source." His context shows that he regards that single source as an extrinsic document Q, and the passages as having appeared in it *consecutively*.

But if we adopt this theory, reconstruct Q so far as this consecutive section is concerned, and eliminate its constituent passages from Mt. and Lk., what are we to say of the residual Logian matter, with the second Matthaean series appearing in Lk.? By parity of reasoning we must hold that the passages in this second series "certainly belong to a single source." To what source then? To a second extrinsic document, Q<sub>2</sub>, in which *these* passages appeared consecutively? But this answer would involve an extremely difficult hypothesis. Not only must we posit two Logian documents of the highest value, and of homogeneous contents; we must also suppose that they were so widely published that both fell into the hands of two evangelists who were ignorant of one another, and worked in entire independence, that both documents have utterly perished, and that one of them, at least, has left in tradition no trace of its separate existence; and we must further suppose that both Lk. and Mt.—still independently of one another—though they distribute the



material of these two sources in different divisions and in different contexts, yet adhere all but exactly to the order of their two interwoven sources. We must hold this in face of the fact that other homogeneous Logian matter, whose source is left unexplained, was distributed in different order by these two evangelists.

Such a hypothesis can hardly be maintained. We are driven to the conclusion that if the source of the first series was an extrinsic document Q, then the second series was also derived from that same Q. Now Harnack (op. cit. p. 180) expresses the conclusion "that St Matthew has preserved the order of the source more faithfully than St Luke. It therefore follows with no slight probability that those parts of the Sermon on the Mount which are common to St Matthew and St Luke, and yet do not stand in the same order in the two gospels [here enumerated by Harnack in his own numeration], occurred in Q in the order of St Matthew, and that St Luke has separated and distributed them throughout his work for reasons which can no longer be discovered (in the belief that he could trace a better *τάξις*). We shall be justified in deciding similarly concerning other sections which occur in different positions in St Matthew and St Luke, and in regarding St Luke in this matter as capricious in the extreme."

Let us withhold judgment concerning the question whether Luke's reasons can be discovered, and whether he was actuated by caprice; for the rest, let us take Harnack's hypothesis, and examine its consequences :

(a) The inclusion of Sermon-on-the-Mount passages in the first series leaves nine passages, still to be accounted for, in the second series; these must presumptively, by parity of reasoning, share the same treatment.

(b) There are also seven Sermon-on-the-Mount passages in the residue, after elimination of my three series. The transfer of these to the first series leaves only ten passages out of the seventeen in which no clear Matthaean order could be traced.

(c) But these ten passages (Mt. 15, 14*b*; 13, 16, 17; 22, 35*a*; 12, 32; 13, 33; 23, 37-39, 12; 22, 9; 11, 12, 13; 17, 20*b*) are also, it seems, to be transferred (according to the last sentence quoted from Harnack) to the first series.

(d) And we may finally, either on a like principle to that which disposes of the second series (*a*), or to that which disposes of the remnant passages (*c*), find a place for the third series, Mt. 10, 24-38, in the first series.

(e) Our guiding principle in placing these various passages must be that Mt. has better preserved the order of Q, while Luke's arrangement is an apparently capricious dislocation of that order. That is to say, we restore all these Logian passages to the order which they hold in Mt.

The result of this consistent application of the rule laid down by Harnack is that the first series, Harnack's Q, now includes *all* the Logian matter common to Mt. and Lk., and *presents it in the order of Mt.* In other words, the source of the Logian matter in Lk. is in substance and order identical with the Logian matter in Mt.

Was there however a difference of text between Q and the Logia in Mt.? According to Harnack's own investigation of the text (which investigation presupposes Q, and cannot be used to support the existence of Q) the difference was so slight and doubtful that it may, at this stage, be left out of account. [The following notes refer

to particular passages: "Almost always St Luke appears as the evangelist who has altered the original text," p. 2. "The variants in St Luke, in so far as they are of a stylistic character, appear throughout as secondary readings," p. 6. "Here again we see at once that in matters of style Q is represented more closely by St Matthew," p. 9. "The Lukan text is certainly clearer and so far better, but it is scarcely original," p. 11. "The original lies in St Matthew," p. 12. "The order of words is changed by St Luke," p. 13. "*ὑπάγετε* is an addition of St Luke," p. 13. "In the majority of cases there is no need of proof that here St Luke's recension is everywhere secondary;...accordingly St Matthew's recension is to be preferred in the neutral cases (with the exception of *ὁ Ἰησοῦς* occurring twice)," p. 15. "The introduction is, as usual, more or less transformed by St Luke," p. 18. And so on, with few and slight exceptions, throughout. In a summary on p. 37: "On the whole it may be said that St Matthew has treated the discourses with great respect, and has edited them in a very conservative spirit." Very nearly all the alterations assigned to Mt. by Harnack are descried in phrases which, in his eyes, cannot have stood in Q, because they are distinctively Matthaean phrases. "There remain only the addition of 'Righteousness' and '*πρῶτον*' [in 6, 33], and the transformation of the 'Sign of Jonah,' which transformation may have been found by him already carried out in his exemplar of Q. In contrast with these few instances of correction on the part of St Matthew, we reckon *nearly one hundred and fifty instances of correction by St Luke; but these are all, with few exceptions, of a stylistic character.*" (This summary refers to Logian passages which are nearly identical

in Mt. and Lk.) It is clear, then, that Harnack sees the text of Q substantially reproduced in Mt., and that nearly all the alterations supposed to have been made by Mt. arise out of the supposed necessity of establishing a non-Matthæan text of Q.]

But if Luke's Q was in substance, order and text identical with the *Logia* in Mt., what need of Q at all? It is obvious that if Luke worked on Mt., instead of on a hypothetical Q, the result of his work would be what it actually is. Since, however, any theory of Q must rest on the need to explain the phenomena of Lk.'s Logian matter and text in comparison with the Logian matter and text of Mt., all that such a theory can yield us will now be yielded by the simpler theory, *Lk. worked on the text of Mt.*

This result is admittedly attained by examination of only one theory of Q, and there are many others. May it not be that we have here simply a refutation of Harnack, rather than a criticism of the Q hypothesis in general? The answer is that if Harnack's version of the Q hypothesis will not stand, no other version will stand, since Harnack alone has taken full and fair account of the agreement in order (so far as he perceived it) between Mt. and Lk. in their Logian matter. Most Q-theories regard the Lucan order as the more nearly original. Thus Dr Stanton: "There is a strong presumption in favour of the view that the order in which Luke has given the pieces is in the main that of the source" (*The Gospels as Historic Documents*, II. p. 78). Thus also Canon Hawkins: "It is thus certain that at least one—and if only one, it would be Mt.—of the two compilers took but little account of

the order and sequence of Q" (*Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, p. 120. But Hawkins does not regard Lk.'s order as being actually that of Q). Thus again Canon Streeter (op. cit. p. 151), Professor Burkitt, and other English scholars; and in Germany Von Soden, with numerous supporters. But the phenomena of comparative order, even in the form in which they have already been set out, resist all attempts to derive the Matthaean arrangement from the Lucan, while they admit of explanation on the assumption that the passages are taken by Luke from Matthew.

It is natural at this point to refer to the strong presumption that Lk. was acquainted with Mt. which arises from the number and the nature of coincidences between Mt. and Lk. against Mk in the triple parallel. The evidence is, on the face of it, so strong that no critic who touches the Synoptic Problem can afford to neglect it, though the difficulty of reconciling its apparent purport with the Q hypothesis determines the manner in which it is treated. Dr Stanton, for instance, devotes more than ten pages (140 to 150) of his *Gospels as Historic Documents*, II., to an examination of this evidence, in order to show that other causes are adequate to account for the phenomena. Four causes are enumerated: an Ur-Marcus, undesigned agreement, the influence upon both Mt. and Lk. of unknown documents or oral teaching, and textual assimilation. Each of these is undoubtedly a *vera causa* (though the third cannot be pressed far without an appeal to Q, and must not therefore be used as an argument for the existence of Q) and each will account for several coincidences considered singly. The facts do not however

justify the summary statement (pp. 141, 142) that while "it will be found on examination that no single cause can afford a natural explanation in every instance...always one of the causes...specified will do so, and often more than one." There are instances of coincidence between Mt. and Lk. against Mk which none of these causes will explain. There are also classes of cases, which as classes (and only as classes) are significant, that cannot be explained at all except by an acquaintance of Lk. with Mt.

The Ur-Marcus is necessary to explain certain cases. To explain others, as Schmiedel has shown in his article in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (1766), a revised or corrected Mark is required. In what sense can it be true that the common document on which Mt. and Lk. worked was at once prior to and secondary to canonical Mark<sup>1</sup>? Dr Stanton's second cause<sup>2</sup> is applied by him to agreement by Mt. and Lk. in the use of δέ where Mk uses καί. "That they should happen frequently to be in accord in making [changes of such a kind] without either having any knowledge of the work of the other, could cause no surprise." This is an appeal to the Law of Probability—a perfectly legitimate appeal in such a case: only it should be decided in the court in which it is made. Mark has (on my counting) about 401 cases of καί where δέ might be written. Mt. turns 79 of these, Lk. turns 104 of these, into δέ. According to the Law of Probability

<sup>1</sup> See below, pp. 28, 29.

<sup>2</sup> That is to say, mere coincidence. No literary or grammatical principle of selection common to Mt. and Lk. is exhibited or alleged. A comparison of Mt. with Lk.'s peculiar matter gives no support to such a hypothesis.

their undesigned agreement should extend to about 21 cases (i.e.  $79 \times 104 \div 401$ ). In two experiments which I made (instructing two different persons, at a distance, to make substitutions at will, out of 401 cases, one to the number of 79, the other to the number of 104) the results were: a coincidence in the first experiment of 22 cases, in the second of 20 cases. But the actual coincidence between Mt. and Lk. is of 46 cases. (In order to make 46 cases probable the number of sectional *καί*'s in Mk would have to be not 401, but 178.) These 46 coincidences cannot, then, be explained by a theory of mere chance, working upon a common literary preference. Nor will a Corrected Mark satisfy the requirements: for while it would certainly explain the cases of coincidence severally, it would leave unexplained the margin of cases where only one evangelist substitutes *δέ* for *καί*, and the still larger margin where neither does so. On the other hand the hypothesis that both Mt. and Lk. were inclined, in much the same degree, to vary the tedious series of sectional *καί*'s by an occasional *δέ*, and that Lk. was also subject to the slight suggestion afforded by a *δέ* in Mt. against a *καί* in Mk, exactly fits the facts: namely the difference between the probable number of chance coincidences (21) and the actual number appearing (46), and the difference between the number of Mt.'s cases (79) and that of Lk.'s cases (104); the working of Mt.'s example—perhaps almost unconsciously—accounts for the excess of cases in Lk. as compared with Mt. This type of argument is distrusted by many scholars, who are unaware of its proven value in Shaksperian criticism, and suspect, perhaps, that it involves the application of a rigid measure to an elastic material. In reality its peculiar merit lies in this,



that it provides a measure of the degree of elasticity which may be imputed to the material. It disposes of the contention, "Since this material is elastic we may stretch it as far as we please." Even those who distrust such reasoning will admit that if an exact statement of a mathematical probability is ever in order, it is in order when used to confute an inexact statement of that mathematical probability. (The precise form of the argument depends, of course, on the numbers, and the number 401 may be challenged. It is the result of careful scrutiny. If the margin of error, in excess, be as high as 30, that will only increase the probability of coincidence to 22; even if so great as 100—a preposterous assumption—the probability would still be only 27. So that on any view of it short of downright fraud its practical effect is the same.)

Individual instances of Matthaeo-Lucan coincidence against Mark, such as no hypothesis except the dependence of Lk. on Mt. will explain without undue forcing, can be found. These three come from the list of those which both Schmiedel and Hawkins note as significant (though not, in their view, decisively significant): Lk. 9, 11, where *οἱ ὄχλοι...ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ* is Matthaean (14, 13) and non-Marcian, but *γνόντες* comes from *ἔγνωσαν* in Mk 6, 33; Lk. 23, 54, where *ἐπέφωσκεν* recalls *ἐπιφωσκούση* in Mt. 28, 1, but has no original in Mk; Lk. 24, 4, where *ἀστραπτούση* recalls *ἀστραπή* in Mt. 28, 3, but has no original in Mk. In the last case the influence of oral tradition may no doubt be invoked, just as it might be invoked to explain any coincidence between Lk. and Mk (and *is* so invoked by at least one scholar); but it is an unnecessary device, when such cases as the other two

can only be naturally explained by the dependence of one evangelist on the other.

The objections to this view are based on the facts (i) that Lk. omits much Matthaean matter, and (ii) that the accounts of the same episode and the versions of the same speeches in the two gospels are often divergent.

The answers to (i) may be briefly summarised thus:

(a) Omission must not be measured, but weighed. Lk. was not concerned, we may suppose, to omit such and such a number of words, but to omit notices and sayings which seemed to him unsuited to be included in his gospel. The omissions, considered severally, are often easily accounted for.

(b) Lk. certainly had access to much peculiar material, and the most notable of his omissions are explained by the inconcinnity of the Matthaean notices with the peculiar notices of Lk.

(c) Omission does not, in fact, any more than mutation, raise any strong presumption against the use of the document from which omission is made. There is no example in the N.T., and few in literary history, where a document has been embodied wholesale by a redactor.

(d) Lk. omits many notices of Mk, and on one view some or all of these formed part of the Mk-document which lay before him. (So, e.g., Hawkins, in *Oxford Studies*.) Yet no critic now questions Lk.'s acquaintance with Mk. This in itself weakens almost to inanition this particular objection to Lk.'s acquaintance with Mt.

The answers to (ii) may be thus summarised:

(e) See (c) above. Both Mt. and Lk. depart from the representation in Mk.

(f) See (b) above. The acknowledged use of peculiar

sources (written or oral) by Lk. makes divergence from Mt., especially in places where he is not supported by Mk, extremely likely to arise in the third gospel.

(g) This applies to sayings as well as notices; but here there is also another source of variance, namely the very well marked character and *Tendenz* of the third evangelist.

(h) In Marcan notices this argument cannot tell against an acquaintance of Lk. with Mt., for there Lk.'s divergences either indicate a preference for Mk, or else cannot be pressed without attacking the belief that Lk. was acquainted with Mk.

(i) In non-Markan passages the assumption that Lk. would not have varied from Mt.'s version cannot give us any help, if the alternative theory of a common non-Markan source is set up: for then we must rule (on a similar assumption) that Mt. would not have varied from the source, and that Lk. would not, and that the writer behind the one or the other would not have produced a different version of Q, and so on, until we make the divergence impossible: but it is a fact. An *oral* theory would meet this point; but the difficulties of an oral theory are by most scholars considered insuperable.

We have, then, to account for *all* the coincidences of Mt. and Lk., two alternative theories.

The first requires one hypothesis only, which explains at once the bulk of the facts, and is inconsistent with none: namely, that as Lk. knew Mk, so he also knew Mt.

The second requires a whole series of hypotheses:

(i) The hypothesis that what lay before Mt. and Lk. was an ancestor of canonical Mk, to explain phenomena

noticed by Professor Stanton (*The Gospels as Historical Documents*, II.) on pp. 142–145, and by Professor Schmiedel (*Ency. Bib.*) in columns 1851, 1852.

(ii) The hypothesis that what lay before Mt. and Lk. was a descendant of canonical Mk, to explain phenomena noticed by Schmiedel (op. cit.) in columns 1766, 1767, and by Dr Abbott (*Corrections of Mark*).

(iii) The stretching of mere chance coincidence, or the effects of similar literary preference in two different, dissimilar, independent redactors, to cover phenomena which, both in nature and in number, exceed the scope of such a hypothesis in any other literary problem.

(iv) A special theory of manuscript-assimilation in the second century, peculiar to the two documents Mt. and Lk.

(v) A corollary to (iv): a special theory of the abeyance of Mk during that century, so that this gospel almost ceased to be copied at all.

(vi) Q.

(vii) Other vaguely conceived documents, with which both Mt. and Lk. may have been acquainted, to explain certain phenomena illustrated by Dr Stanton (op. cit.), p. 148.

(viii) Some sort of oral theory, to explain facts illustrated (op. cit.), p. 149.

(ix) A theory that some coincidences of Mt. and Lk. against Mk are really corruptions of text, and are to be considered absent from the earlier and truer text of the first and third gospels (*Journal of Theological Studies*, Jan. 1909).

It cannot be contended that any one of these hypotheses,

except (in my view) the third, is impossible. But the emergence of so many, in an effort to cover phenomena which are all but perfectly accounted for by one hypothesis, simpler than any of these, is in itself significant. The old principle of economy of hypothesis is being arrantly transgressed. And after all, as I have shown, it is doubtful whether the whole group of hypotheses will explain all the facts.

Moreover some of them call for brief comment.

The crude contradiction of (i) and (ii) has naturally not been allowed to stand. A reconciling hypothesis has been set up (v. *Oxford Studies*, p. 23) according to which an early copy of original Mk fell into the hands of a scribe whose habit it was to correct and improve the texts which he copied. Two descendants of his work fell severally into the hands of Mt. and Lk. This version of Mk then perished. What we possess in canonical Mk is a descendant along a line which escaped correction, but underwent slight corruption or casual improvement. This theory fits all the facts that could be explained by (i) and (ii). But it raises certain difficulties. We require another special hypothesis to account for the survival only of the uncorrected Mk, while it was the corrected Mk that fell into the hands of both Mt. and Lk.—men, so far as we know, very far apart in everything except their common character as sacred writers. Indeed, two hypotheses are needed: one, that the corrected Mk perished *because* it had been embodied by Mt. and Lk.; the other, to bring both Mt. and Lk. to Antioch or Caesarea, where “two sister copies of St Mark’s Gospel might quite easily have been brought” from Rome. All these things are metaphysically possible, though the reason proposed for the disappearance of the more literary

Mk is somewhat unconvincing. But what bold excursions in the unknown we are forced to make, rather than accept the simple, obvious and satisfactory dependence-hypothesis!

(iv) and (v) are improbable surmises. It is true that patristic citation is usually from the longer gospels: and it is equally true to-day that Mt., and certain portions of Lk., are much more quoted than Mk. But there is no evidence at all that canonical Mk was ever regarded as an extra-canonical book. It is certain that second-century versions included Mk as well as Mt. and Lk., and all the evidence available goes to show that from the earliest times when collections of Christian scriptures were made Mk held his present position. Since assimilation works through the memory of the scribe, it would affect Mk also; and since Mk has so little peculiar matter, it would affect Mk relatively more than Mt. or Lk. Moreover we have no evidence of such wholesale and universal assimilation as is here presumed. Later analogy is against it. We know of certain great textual influences in which Mk shared like the rest, such as the confections of the Syrian redaction. We know of many sporadic assimilations affecting single MSS. or groups of MSS. We know also of a conservative, restorative normalism, without which Hort's great work of classification and distinction would have been impossible. The hypothesis that behind an ideal text, attested by B with Old Latin, Old Syriac and Sahidic support, we should still have to reckon with assimilation of such extent as to transform the texts of Mt. and Lk., is highly improbable. How did it elude "the watchful scholars of Alexandria"?

It is in the interest of hypothesis (vi), the supposed

documentary Q, that the auxiliary hypotheses are called into being. It is in the interest of Q that the apparent import of the Matthaео-Lucan coincidences is resisted. The symmetry of the doctrine that, just as Mt. and Lk. derive one part of their common matter from Mk, so they shall be held to derive the other part from a second written source, has fascinated three generations of New Testament critics. Nevertheless the problem propounded in 1838, namely to define a document, containing the matter common to Mt. and Lk. in non-Marcан passages, so that it shall be a coherent entity, and shall explain the phenomena of Mt. and Lk. better than a dependence-theory, has never been solved. Tentative reconstructions of Q by various scholars have exhibited such various results, and have been exposed to such destructive criticism from men who confidently accept the Q hypothesis in general, that Professor Burkitt (with whom Canon Hawkins agrees) has pronounced all such attempts "futile." Q cannot be determined, because in order to work at all Q must remain indeterminate. Each critic in turn, in view of the particular part of the Synoptic Problem on which he is working, must be able to apply a specially adapted conception of this purely hypothetical document. Thus Q is continually raising new problems, and instead of simply superseding one feasible solution by another that is more satisfactory, it is itself the centre of a vortex of controversy. Out of the 436 pages of the *Oxford Studies* already quoted no less than 167 pages (Essays III-VI and IX) are directly concerned with the discussion of what must, or may, or cannot have stood in Q, or what must, or may, or cannot have been the order of Q. Essay XI is also concerned with these questions, and incidental treatment of them is



found in other essays of the series. The nature of some of the difficulties and dissensions which Q brings about shall be very briefly, but sufficiently, illustrated.

This document will not do the work for which it was invented unless it accounts for the non-Markan community of Lk. and Mt. in the Baptism, the Temptation, and certain other passages to which Mk presents a parallel. But when the common non-Markan passages are detached it is at once to be seen that they cannot have stood in any document without connecting links, and the links which are logically required are precisely those which appear in due place in Mt. and Lk. (The *exact* determination of a text for Q is complicated here also by differences between Mt. and Lk., but not to an extent that vitiates this argument.) These links however appear also in Mk. Hence it is held that Mk was acquainted with Q, and that in these places his work represents a "mutilation" or abridgment of Q. Wernle, on the other hand, holds that Mk's acquaintance with Q is shown by the skill with which Mk avoids using the matter already used in Q. The two contentions are not inconsistent, and lead to a common conclusion, established, as Canon Streeter says, "beyond reasonable doubt, that Mark was familiar with Q." Now it can also be shown beyond reasonable doubt that the passage which occurs in Mt. 4, 23-25 was made use of by Lk. in his paraphrase of certain Marcan notices, and also that this passage is, in Mt., a summary of those same Marcan notices. If Q is to work, this passage, since it was known both to Mt. and Lk., and is non-Markan, must have appeared in Q. That is to say, Q must have contained a synopsis of certain consecutive passages in Mk. We obtain the curious result that Mk was familiar with Q, and Q was skilfully avoided,

save here and there, in Mk's supplementary work; but this supplementary work of Mk was at the same time a basis for a passage in Q.

Moreover the inclusion in Q of the narrative Marcan passages alluded to above, together with the Centurion notice, and the possible inclusion of the kindred piece about the Canaanite woman, raise the probability that Q was no mere collection of sayings, but a gospel. A gospel with no account of the Passion is improbable in an extreme degree. Accordingly Professor Burkitt explains the non-Markan details in Lk.'s account of the Passion by deriving them from Q. This view Canon Streeter (op. cit. p. 203) considers "incredible." (Q, he believes, was written to *supplement* a living tradition, just as Mk, according to Wernle, was written to supplement Q.) But Canon Streeter hastens to add that Lk. may have found an account of the Passion in an expanded version of Q. Q, in fact, was an informal compilation, which "would undoubtedly gather up words of the Master floating in current tradition"; and "the traditions current in one Church would not be the same as those in another" (p. 205). (This scholar regards other (non-Matthaeian) matter in Lk. as gathered immediately from "floating tradition," p. 207.) So that, to reconcile the views of these two critics, Q must cease to be a definite document, and become an informal compilation, varying in its contents from year to year and from place to place. Such an *x* will of course do, at any one moment, whatever you may require of it. But will it explain collectively the very numerous and extremely definite non-Markan coincidences of Mt. and Lk.?

The examination of these coincidences in point of order is now to be resumed.

## CHAPTER II

### MATTHEW A SOURCE OF LUKE

#### § 1. **The disposition of Matthaean matter in Luke.**

Although the two or three Matthaean series in Lk. point very clearly, as we have seen, to canonical Mt. as a direct source of the Logia in Lk., they do not of themselves reveal Lk.'s principles of arrangement. An attempt must now be made to discover in the disposition of the Matthaean matter in Lk. some indication of the method on which it has been selected and connected. Since the Marcan scheme has provided the general framework both in Mt. and Lk., we may enquire, in the first place, whether any phenomena can be found in the arrangement of the Lucan Logia which bring it into relation with the Marcan framework in Lk.

The following particulars appear in the distribution of Matthaean matter in Lk.:

(a) Almost the whole of it<sup>1</sup> is included in the two great insertions (Lk. 6, 20-8, 3 and 9, 51-18, 14) which suspend the progress of the Marcan parallel. These insertions consist almost exclusively of Matthaean matter and matter peculiar to Lk.

<sup>1</sup> All except passages 1, 2, 3, and one appearance of 40 (all in the Marcan contexts where they appear in Mt.), 100 and 81.

(b) In neither case does Lk. resume the Marcan parallel precisely at the point where he suspended it. The first insertion leaves Mk at Mk 3, 19, and takes it up again at 4, 1 (though a parallel to the preceding verses Mk 3, 31-35 soon appears); the second leaves it at 9, 40, resumes it at 10, 13. There are thus four Marcan points objectively fixed in the gospel scheme of Lk. The parallel places in Mt. are: A, Mt. 12, 15; B, Mt. 13, 1<sup>1</sup>; C, Mt. 18, 4; D, Mt. 19, 13.

(c) The first insertion begins at the very beginning of the Logian collection in Mt., with Mt. 5, 3. A Matthaean series in substantially Matthaean order runs on right through the first insertion, is resumed at the beginning of the second insertion, and continues as far as Lk. 10, 22 = Mt. 11, 27. [It is cemented here and there by a short piece of peculiar Lucan matter; at the break caused by the Marcan section between the insertions several more considerable Lucan passages are placed; there too, for reasons already noted (p. 12), the passage Mt. 11, 2-11, 16-19 is now to be found; the only other Matthaean pieces which disturb the sequence are: Mt. 12, 35, 34b (linked on to Mt. 7, 18 = 12, 33), Mt. 7, 12 and 10, 24, 25a (included in the range of this sequence, but placed out of order, and in such a way that each interrupts a context), and Mt. 15, 14b, which comes immediately before Mt. 10, 24, 25a. The break in the sequence is at Mt. 8, 13 (Lk. 7, 10), and it is resumed at Mt. 8, 19 (Lk. 8, 57).] *This may be called Sequence (a).*

(d) After a passage of two verses from Mt. 13, a Marco-Matthaean passage from Mt. 22, and some peculiar

<sup>1</sup> In my view (see below, p. 48) points A and B were identical in Lk.'s Marcan source.

matter, we come to another, much shorter, Matthaean sequence, from Mt. 6, 1 to Mt. 7, 11 (Lk. 11, 2-13), dealing with prayer. *This may be called Sequence (β).*

(e) Immediately after this (Lk. 11, 14-32) comes a Matthaean sequence from Mt. 12, 22-45. *This may be called Sequence (γ).*

(f) After six verses (two of which are Matthaean) we find in Lk. 11, 39-52 another Matthaean sequence from Mt. 23. *This may be called Sequence (δ).*

(g) At the end of the second insertion (Lk. 17, 23-18, 14 is peculiar) stands yet another sequence from Mt. 24. *This may be called Sequence (ξ).*

(h) Between (δ) and (ξ) lies an area in which the Matthaean order is extremely confused. It appears as if two different sequences were here destructively entangled, and further interrupted by fragments broken off from other sequences, and by isolated Matthaean verses, which belong to no sequence. For instance, the whole of my second series except the first section and the last, and three of the four sections of my third series, appear in this area; there is also a passage continuous with (ξ), and another continuous with (δ), verses excluded from (α) and (β), and loose fragments like Mt. 13, 33; 17, 20b. Still, the suggestion of a thread on which the rest may have been strung is offered by the following passages in succession: Mt. 6, 25-33, 20, 21; 7, 13, 14, 22, 23; 8, 11, 12; 12, 10b, 11; 18, 12, 13; 7 (6, which is Marcan), 15, 21, 22. To this sequence, should it reveal itself as a real sequence, and not a merely accidental succession of passages, we may tentatively give the name of *Sequence (ε).*

It is clear that the main task of any hypothesis which may be based on the other Sequences must be to explain

the derangement of Matthaean order in this part of Luke's second insertion.

Comparison of the above facts leads to the following observations:

(1) All the presumptively Logian passages which occur in Mt. before the beginning of his great collection in Mt. 5, 6 and 7 appear in Lk. before the beginning of his first insertion (which coincides with the beginning of Mt.'s collection) and are placed by Lk. in the Marcan contexts selected for them by Mt. (These are however their only natural contexts.)

(2) Lk.'s Sequence ( $\alpha$ ) consists entirely of Matthaean matter which appears in Mt. before point A.

(3) Lk.'s Sequence ( $\beta$ ) consists also of matter from before point A, namely matter which has been omitted from the connected Sequence ( $\alpha$ ), and is bound together by its subject matter.

(4) Lk.'s Sequence ( $\gamma$ ) consists entirely of Matthaean matter from the area between points A and B.

(5) Lk.'s two Sequences ( $\delta$ ) and ( $\zeta$ ) consist exclusively of matter which appears in Mt. after point D.

(6) Guided by this clue we are now able to observe: that the matter taken from Mt. between B and C is very slight in quantity and disconnected (Mt. 13, 16, 17; 33; 15, 14*b*; 17, 20*b*), and that since this cannot possibly form a sequence it is fitted in piece-wise where possible (Mt. 15, 14*b* occurs out of order); also that

(7) The whole of the matter taken from between C and D is found in the disturbed area, in Lk. 14-17, 4, which contains a large amount of peculiar matter; most of the Matthaean matter (18, 7 (6), 15*a*, 21, 22) appears as

a sequence in Lk. 17, 1-4; the fact that Mt. 18, 12, 13, now stands somewhat earlier (in Lk. 15) suggests that this portion of Lk. has been expanded by insertions (of Matthaean and peculiar matter) and that this sequence, in an earlier and longer form, stood in closer connection; and Mt. 5, 13 (= Mk 9, 50, between C and D) and Mt. 5, 32 (with affinity for Mk 10, 11, 12, Mt. 19, 9, between C and D) also appear here—the one shortly before 18, 12, 13, the other between 18, 12, 13 and 18, 7.

In sum: the disposition of the Matthaean matter in Lk. is determined by its disposition in Mt. with relation to certain fixed points A, B, C and D; these points in Mt. are determined by their Marcan parallels, Mk 3, 19; 4, 1; 9, 40; 10, 13; and these in turn are determined by Lk.'s treatment of Mk, viz. by the breaks which Lk. makes in the Marcan narrative. It follows that the fixed points in Mt. by which Lk. regulates his disposition of Matthaean matter are themselves determined by Lk.'s editorial work on Mk. The inference is inevitable that Lk. **made use of Mk and Mt. concurrently**. He apparently regarded Mk as the better authority for narrative, and Mt. as the better for sayings of Jesus (the matter omitted by Lk. from Mk between Mk 3, 19 and 4, 1<sup>1</sup>, and again between 9, 40 and 10, 13, is nearly all sayings). Lk. used Mk as the basis of his gospel; paused now and again at a convenient place to gather up the sayings which appeared up to that point in Mt.; and dealt with such a collection of sayings, between point and point, as matter to be separately handled.

<sup>1</sup> If Mk 3, 22-30 was part of the Marcan text used by Lk.



## § 2. The καθέξῆς principle.

It is also obvious, quite apart from Lk.'s own later avowal, that he was trying to deal with this matter καθέξῆς, in a sequential or connected manner. But this was no easy task, for as presented by Mt. it often exhibited no connectedness at all. What, for instance, has Mt. 7, 12 to do with 7, 11, or 7, 13 with 7, 12, or 7, 15 sqq. with 7, 13, 14? And what internal link reveals itself between the three consecutive sections 7, 1-5; 7, 6; 7, 7-11? In order to reduce such a congeries to a rational sequence various devices must be employed. If some common idea can be detected in a number of neighbouring passages, it can be utilised by setting these passages together, by emphasising the common thought through slight changes of phraseology, by adding an occasional cementing touch and by omitting what is plainly unconformable. In other cases a kind of continuity may be attained which is content to proceed link by link: each passage follows not unnaturally upon its predecessor, but no ruling intention can be traced through the whole. A certain freedom, again, in giving to individual sayings a larger or narrower range of meaning than they have in Mt., or even in changing their reference altogether, will enable Lk. to find new and appropriate places for them. The matter omitted in the process of forming any one such sequence may then be treated *de novo* in the same manner. But the task of arranging such residual passages καθέξῆς will be progressively more and more difficult, and it is almost inevitable that some obstinate fragments should remain without any fitting context. When these have been carried from sequence to sequence, seeking a home and finding none, they must either be rejected altogether or forced into some artificial

and infelicitous connexion. Such, for instance, has been the fate of Mt. 15, 14<sup>b</sup> and 10, 24, 25<sup>a</sup>, now embedded in Lk. 6, 39, 40 between Mt. 7, 2 and 3. The *τυφλὸς τυφλόν* saying, stripped of its original reference, is excused for standing here by *τὸ κάρφος* and *τὴν δοκὸν ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ*, and by *οὐ βλέπων* in Lk. 6, 41, 42 (Mt. 7, 3-5); and the *τότε διαβλέψεις κ.τ.λ.* of Lk. 6, 42 (Mt. 7, 5), gives a faint show of relevance to *κατηρτισμένος δὲ πᾶς κ.τ.λ.* in Lk. 6, 40.

We have now to follow Lk. step by step in his application of these principles and this method to the text of Mk and Mt. Since our purpose is to realise the procedure of a real man in performing a real task it will be convenient to cast our account of his doings into the form of a narrative<sup>1</sup>. This plan cannot obscure the strength or weakness of the case so set forth. External testimony, either for or against it, there is none. Internal testimony may in this way be allowed to appear without being overpressed. The strongest evidence that can be offered in support of such a theory is indeed to embody it in a plain story of fact, which, flowing simply forward and violating no probability, shall straighten out so tangled a sleeve as the disorder of Marcan and Matthaean elements in Lk.

### § 3 Luke<sub>m</sub> and Codex D.

Before actually recounting the manner in which Lk. wrote his gospel it seems well to offer a word of justification for certain readings from Codex D which will on

<sup>1</sup> *Pièces justificatives* will, when they cannot be avoided, be inserted in square brackets.

occasion be adopted. My comparison of the three Synoptic gospels was made, and my conclusions reached, on the basis of WH alone; but after I had formed them I could not help seeing how remarkably they were confirmed, in some places, by the text of the Cambridge Codex. A consequent examination of Codex D has led me to take the following view of its relation to the gospel of Lk. (Whether a similar relation can be made out in case of Acts I have not been concerned to enquire.)

There seems to be plain evidence in Lk. 4, 23 and 38 that the sections on the incidents at Nazareth (Lk: 4, 14b-30) and those in Capernaum (31-44) did not originally stand in their present order. It is incredible that Lk., in a first writing, should have brought in an allusion to *γεγόμενα εἰς τὴν Καφαρναούμ* before they had come to pass. We may assume, therefore, that these sections held originally in Lk. the same relative places which they still hold in Mk, and that the evangelist afterwards, for reasons not very recondite, transposed them.

When did he transpose them? Surely not at any time shortly removed from their first writing; for at such a time (1) the original reasons for placing them in Mk's order would still presumptively hold good; (2) if not, at least the general scheme of his work would still be so fresh in Lk.'s mind that he would have modified 4, 23. Evidence will appear, in the course of our investigation, to show that a considerable period intervened between the first composition of Lk.'s gospel and the revision which affected the order of these sections; that it was only in the revision that large portions of Lk.'s peculiar matter were for the first time inserted; and that in the mean time a gospel of Lk., based chiefly on Mk and Mt., was

actually in circulation. To this earlier edition of Lk. I give the symbol Lk.<sub>m</sub>.

Now it is well known that the distinctive readings of D are most striking and important in Lk. and Acts. If we examine their bulk, in Nestle's *Supplementum*, we see that they are least numerous in John and Mt., and more abundant in Mk, Lk. and Acts. When, again, we distinguish between Lk.<sub>m</sub> and Lk.'s peculiar matter, we find a remarkable difference in the degree of variation of D from the received text. In the peculiar matter of Lk. it is about as low as in Mt., but in Lk.<sub>m</sub> it is about as high as in Mk. [A full demonstration of this assertion would require the display of long and complicated enumerations; but a rough and ready test is easily applied. Take two parallel and equivalent portions like Mk. 6, 32-50, Mt. 14, 13-27; the one has fourteen lines in Nestle, the other eight; then compare the whole of Mk (41 pp. WH) with Mt. 9, 1-25, 35 (also 41 pp. WH); the one requires in Nestle just under 11 pages, the other  $6\frac{1}{8}$  pages. This gives the ratio of D-variation in Mt. to that in Mk as about 8 : 14. Now compare Lk. 1 and 2, peculiar matter, with Lk. 4, 1-6, 36 (the next comparable piece, after the broken type of the genealogy: each occupies 8 pp. WH); the former has fifty-three lines, the latter, which is chiefly Lk.<sub>m</sub>, has ninety-four lines in Nestle;  $53 : 94 = 8 : 14\frac{1}{2}$ . The reader can extend his own tests at pleasure.] That is to say, D evidently preserves, over and above the ordinary array of variants which it has for Lk. as for the other gospels, an extra set of variants specifically for Lk.<sub>m</sub>. Logic invites us to relate this fact with what is distinctive in Lk.<sub>m</sub>, namely that it once circulated as a separate work.

May we then say that the text of D in Matthaeo-

Marcan Lk. is the text of Lk.<sub>m</sub>, the original edition? That would be to say too much. The natural conclusion is rather that D represents a text of second Lk. *corrected* by comparison with a MS. of Lk.<sub>m</sub>, which, as older, was regarded by the scribe of an ancestor of D as the better text. And we may expect to find all the usual faults and virtues of D in this region also. We may expect to find also specifically here conflations of Lk.<sub>m</sub> and the later Lk. We must allow for the possibility of corruptions of both. But at least we shall often have in D, and perhaps at times in Old Latin or Old Syriac without D, a useful clue to the form of Lk.<sub>m</sub> before the revision, and so to Lk.'s way of working on Mk and Mt.

This theory, that D preserves readings of Lk.<sub>m</sub>, the *first* edition of Lk., is the converse of Blass's hypothesis that the Syro-Latin texts represent vestiges of a *second* edition of Lk. (Blass himself regards them as clinging to a *first* edition of Acts.) It is also supported by Nestle's comment (*Introduction to Textual Criticism*, Eng. edition, 1901, pp. 229 sq.) on Zahn's view of the  $\beta$  text. "If you admit that there were two editions of Acts, you must make the same admission in the case of Lk. And conversely, if there was no second edition of the gospel, must you not then look for some other explanation of the variations in Acts?" But the considerations which have led me to my conclusion, and the particular character of that conclusion, owe nothing to the researches of these great scholars, and cannot appeal to any direct support from them.

My theory explains quite simply the fact noticed by Nestle (op. cit. p. 215) that it is only at the beginnings of pericopae in Lk. that variants so long and connected as to

occupy half a line or even a whole line of D are found. He instances Lk. 5, 17, 27; 7, 1, 18; 9, 37; 10, 1, 25; 11, 14; 12, 1 and 24, 13. The last instance is the least striking (an *ἰδοῦ* drops out, *δέ* comes in for *καί*, and the order is thereby affected) and all the rest belong to Lk.<sub>m</sub>. In a revision it is always the beginnings of sections that are most exposed to alteration. Nestle's half-hearted attempt to find the same phenomenon in Mt. and Mk is quite inconclusive. He points to Mt. 17, 22, 24; 20, 29; Mk. 3, 19; 4, 1; 6, 7 (the last is hardly the beginning of a pericope). These all, except the last, which is an assimilation to Mt., are quite slight in comparison with the Lucan cases, and three of them (Mt. 20, 29; Mk. 3, 19; 4, 1) seem to have no relation to the fact that they stand near to the beginning of a section. That in Mt. 17, 22 transposes two words separated by *δέ*, and (with C) reads *ἀνα-* for *συν-*; that in Mt. 17, 24 consists of *καί* for *δέ*, after seven words *δειδράγματα* for *δίδραγμα*, after another word the transposition of *τῷ Πέτρῳ* and *καὶ εἶπαν*, and after six words more *δείδραγμα* again for *δίδραγμα*; that in Mt. 20, 29 begins after five words and is simply the plural for the singular in *ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ ὄχλος πολὺς*; that in Mk 3, 19 is an *εἰς-* added before *ἔρχονται εἰς*; that in Mk 4, 1 is *πρός* (perhaps rightly) for *παρά*, and *συνήχθη* for *συνάγεται* after Mt.; the irrelevant case in Mk 6, 7 is also an assimilation to Mt. None of these resembles in kind or in magnitude such a case as that in Lk. 5, 27, where after the opening *καί* we read in D *ἐλθὼν πάλιν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τὸν ἐπακολουθοῦντα αὐτῷ ὄχλον ἐδίδασκεν καὶ παράγων εἶδεν Λευεὶ τὸν τοῦ Ἀλφαίου* instead of *μετὰ ταῦτα ἐξῆλθεν καὶ ἐθεάσατο τελώνην ὀνόματι Λευεῖν*,—seven words displaced by sixteen entirely different words.

Finally, if it can be made out that D in any of the Lk.<sub>m</sub> readings has affinity with Tatian, it need not be assumed that D is dependent on the Diatessaron. If both editions of Lk. were known to Tatian, which would he choose to work with in his harmony, that which was based chiefly on Mk and Mt., or that in which masses of non-synoptic material repeatedly interrupt the parallelism? It is in that case to be supposed that both the Diatessaron and D go back in this set of variants to Lk.<sub>m</sub>.

Defenders of Q are warned against the suspicion that my intention is to use assimilations to Mt. in a particular ms. of Lk. as a proof that Lk. was copying Mt. My case is complete without D, and though it is true that D throws a pleasant light on certain details, yet the main interest in this suggested relation between Lk.<sub>m</sub> and certain D readings lies not so much in its application to Lk.<sub>m</sub> as in its application to D and the Syro-Latin text.

#### § 4. **Considerations preliminary to Chapter III.**

What follows is a partial abridgment of a work, not yet completed, on the process by which the several particular passages of the third gospel reached their present wording and order. I give here a sketch in outline of the working of my hypothesis in the earlier part of the gospel, as far as the Great Omission.

Certain preconsiderations must be held in view:

(1) When once it is conceded, even hypothetically, that Lk. was acquainted with Mt. as well as with Mk, the assumption that any notice which is common to all three gospels was derived, by Lk. and Mt., from Mk no longer holds good. It may be that Lk. took the passage from Mt., and that Mk is secondary to Mt., or to Lk., or to



both Mt. and Lk. (Here the arguments of Griesbach, and those of the Tübingen critics, may well be reconsidered.) A few passages in Mk which, in my view, are secondary to Lk., or conflate, will be noticed in the course of the essay.

(2) While the presumption that passages of Mk which do not occur in Lk. were absent from Lk.'s copy of Mk remains as strong as before, and the further presumption that passages of Mk which Lk., usually so careful in following the Marcan order, has displaced, were also absent from Lk.'s copy of Mk is still valid (though neither is more than a presumption), we have now to recognise a third possible class of passages absent from Lk.'s copy of Mk, namely those which, although present in both gospels in corresponding position, seem to be secondary in Mk to Lk.

(3) It appears probable—and is generally assumed, in similar cases—that Lk. had before him only one copy of each of his two source-documents: I now speak of Mk and Mt. There seems to be ground for supposing that Lk.'s copy of Mt. was somewhat frayed and worn, and that a word or two here and there had been obliterated or half-obliterated. I shall make use of that hypothesis.

Passages which, appearing in canonical Mk as we have it, were in my view not before Lk. are these:

Mk 1, 2-6 except 4a, ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. [On my counting there are about 596 ἀπαξ λεγόμενα, exclusive of proper names, in Mk. Dr A. Wright (Synopsis) recognises 172 true Marcan sections, of which fifty-four are entirely omitted by Lk. In proportion to the rest of Mk these sections should contain about 173 ἀ.λ. In fact they contain 218 ἀ.λ. This seems to imply that

a redactor of Mk, after Lk. used Mk, employed a somewhat different and somewhat wider vocabulary than the author or authors of Lucan Mk. A large number of *ἀ.λ.* in any Marcan passage, where the subject matter does not of itself require them, raises some presumption that the passage is redactive. Mk 1, 5, 6 (non-Lucan) has nine *ἀ.λ.*: *Ἱεροσολυμείται, ποταμῷ, ἑξομολογούμενοι, τρίχας, δερματίνην* and *ὀσφύν* (both from LXX), *ἀκρίδας, μέλι, ἄγριον*. Similarly 1, 2, 3, 4*b* contains five: *πρό, κατασκευάσει, εὐθείας* and *τρίβους* (both from LXX), *μετανοίας*. The form and syntax are unlike the ordinary style of Mk. This passage also may be secondary.] 1, 9*b* *ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ τῆς Γαλιλαίας* (perhaps also, as similar to 1, 2-6, 1, 10, 11; perhaps also 1, 12, 13); 1, 14*b*, 15 [*μετανοεῖν* only occurs in non-Lucan passages]; 1, 16-20 [displaced by Lk., who shows no sign of having seen it; containing as *ἀ.λ.* not only the technical *ἀμφιβάλλοντας* and *καταρτίζοντας*, but also *προβάς* and *μισθωτῶν*]; 1, 27*b* *ὥστε συνζητεῖν αὐτούς* [*συνζητεῖν* is peculiar to non-Lucan pieces; *ὥστε* is characteristic of such pieces]; 1, 32-39 [the history of this piece will be given later; meanwhile note that *ἐννυχα, κατεδίωξεν, ἀλλαχοῦ* are *ἀ.λ.* in N.T., *ἔδοσεν, ἐπισυνηγμένη, ποικίλαις, κωμοπόλεις* are *ἀ.λ.* in Mk, and *πρὸς τὴν θύραν* is peculiar to non-Lucan pieces (v. 2, 2; 11, 4)]; 1, 45 [where *διαφημίζειν, φανερώς, πάντοθεν* are *ἀ.λ.*, the imperfect of *ἔρχομαι* is apparently confined to this piece and 2, 15 (also non-Lucan), *ὥστε μη-* is peculiar to non-Lucan pieces, and *ἔξω* to passages without a parallel in Marcan place in Lk.]; 2, 1, 2 [*δι' ἡμερῶν* is unique, so is *ἠκούσθη, χωρεῖν* is *ἀ.λ.*, *ὥστε μη-* and *πρὸς τὴν θύραν* are peculiar to non-Lucan pieces]; 2, 5*b*-10, from *λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ* (exclusive) to the second occurrence of

this phrase (inclusive) [this will be dealt with later; the phrase τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ in 2, 8 is peculiar to non-Lucan pieces, but here inorganic; the locution ἀφιέναι ἀμαρτίας only occurs at 1, 4, 5 (see above) and four times in this passage; the finite verb ἐπιγινώσκειν is unknown to Mk, and ἐπιγινούς 2, 8 only recurs in non-Lucan pieces, 5, 30; 6, 54, but verb and participle are common in Lk. (seven times in the gospel, more often in Acts); ἐγείρου 2, 9 (if B is right) is unique]; 2, 12<sup>b</sup> (perhaps ἔμπροσθεν πάντων) and ὥστε...εἶδαμεν [where δοξάζειν is ἀ.λ. and both ὥστε and ἐξίστασθαι are characteristic of non-Lucan pieces]; 2, 13 [for ἤρχετο see above on 1, 45]; 2, 14 [the fact that τελώνιον is ἀ.λ. is unimportant, but the verse will be considered later]; 3, 7–12 [this will be separately considered; meanwhile it may be noted how little of it is verbally represented either in Mt. or Lk.; that ἀνεχώρησεν (a Matthaean word) and πλήθος (a Lucan word) occur in Mk only in 3, 7, 8; that Ἰδουμαίαις, πλοῖάριον, προσκαρτερῇ, θλίβωσιν, ἐπιπίπτειν are ἀ.λ., and that μάστιγας only recurs at 5, 29 and 5, 34 in non-Lucan pieces]; in 3, 13–15 the phrases καὶ ἀπὸ πᾶσιν πρὸς αὐτόν, οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν ἵνα ὥσιν μετ' αὐτοῦ καί, and perhaps κηρύσσειν καί; 3, 16–4, 1<sup>a</sup>, bodily [this will be considered; but note now as peculiar to non-Lucan pieces; 3, 20 συνέρχεται and ὥστε μή, 3, 21 οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ (ἀ.λ. but cf. τὰ παρ' αὐτῆς 5, 26), 3, 31 στήκοντες, 3, 34 ἴδε, 3, 35 τὸ θέλημα; for ἔξω 3, 31, 32 see on 1, 45 above; ἀ.λ. occur at 3, 21 ἐξέστη (in this sense), 3, 22 ἄρχοντι (in this sense), 3, 27 διαρπάσαι, διαρπάσει]; 4, 1<sup>c</sup> ὥστε...ἦσαν; 4, 10<sup>b</sup> ὅτε ἐγένετο κατὰ νόμον [κατὰ νόμον is ἀ.λ.]; 4, 13?; 4, 26–29 [μῆκύνηται is ἀ.λ. in N.T., βλαστᾶ, αὐτομάτη, πλήρης, δρέπανον (from LXX) and θερισμός are ἀ.λ. in Mk, and

σπόρος (3, 26, 27) does not recur in Mk]; 4, 30-34 [ὁμοιω-  
σωμεν, κόκκῳ, σινάπεως, λαχάνων, σκιάν, and κατασκηνοῖν  
(from LXX) are ἀ.λ., but the matter accounts for all these,  
except in some degree the first; χωρίς is rather more  
significant, and perhaps ἐπέλυν; but nothing could be  
built on them]; probably ἐμβαίνοντος αὐτοῦ in 5, 19,  
though if so some phrase must have been displaced<sup>1</sup>;  
5, 21; 5, 26 [where, besides τὰ παρ' αὐτῆς (cf. on 3, 21)  
δαπανήσασα and εἰς τὸ χεῖρον are ἀ.λ.]; 5, 29b καὶ  
ἔγνω...μάστιγος; 5, 30b ἐπιγνούς ἐν ἑαυτῷ...ἐξεληθούσαν;  
5, 34d καὶ ἴσθι...σου [for μάστιξ see above on 3, 10;  
ἴαται 5, 29 is a rather striking ἀ.λ.; ὑγιής is ἀ.λ.,  
and the form ἴσθι does not recur in Mk]; 6, 5b εἰ  
μὴ...ἐθεράπευσεν [ὀλίγους, ἀρρώστοις and ἐπιθεῖς τὰς  
χεῖρας are all peculiar to non-Lucan passages]; 6, 12  
[ἀρρώστους recurs here, and μετανοῶσιν is also peculiar  
to non-Lucan pieces; ἐλαίῳ is (insignificantly) ἀ.λ.;  
perhaps some notice of this kind stood here]; 6, 14, 15  
[ἐνεργοῦσιν is ἀ.λ.; the passage seems out of place here,  
and comes from 8, 28]; 6, 30b καὶ ὅσα ἐδίδαξαν to 6, 34  
[ἀναπαύσασθε recurs in the non-Lucan 14, 41; ὑπάγοντες  
3, 31, ὑπάγοντας 3, 33 does not recur in this form; ὑπάγει  
appears at 14, 21, where no true Lucan parallel stands;  
the only other use of the word in Mk (frequent) is the  
imperative; ὑμεῖς αὐτοί, εὐκαίρουν, πεζῇ, συνέδραμον are  
ἀ.λ.]; and, it may be, a number of trivial phrases.

[I must guard against the suspicion that the hypothesis  
in paragraph (3) above, or the hypothesis that such and  
such passages were not before Lk., is necessary to the

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps however Mk 5, 18-20 was all secondary. See below,  
pp. 78 and 104.

working of my dependence-theory. Very little use is made of the former, and it is only employed to explain facts not otherwise explicable. Both hypotheses are results of my theory, not preconditions for its possibility. As regards Marcan pieces not represented in Lk., the only fact of which any theory has to take cognisance is that they are absent from Lk. As regards the rest of the passages included in my list, they are illustrations of the manner in which this dependence-theory explains various phenomena, not only in the text of Lk., but also in the text of Mk and of Mt.

In what follows I shall silently assume the absence of all the passages enumerated from the text of Mk which lay before Lk.]

## CHAPTER III

### THE COMPOSITION OF LUKE<sub>m</sub> (UP TO THE GREAT OMISSION)

#### § 1. **Work on Mark and Matthew.**

Though the preface which now opens the third gospel was no part of its earlier text, yet the avowal *ἔδοξεν ἐμοὶ παρακολουθηκότι ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς καθεξῆς γράψαι* clearly expresses a demand of Lk.'s own nature. He wished, in all his studies and exercises, to be consecutive, comprehensive and exact. He was, at the time when he began Lk.<sub>m</sub>, probably a young man, of some literary culture, careful and a little self-conscious in his choice of language, one who weighed forms of expression, weeded and enlarged his vocabulary, was eager to learn, and anxious not to learn amiss. The two rolls on which he was working were probably regarded by him as two variants of the same book: but he seems to have regarded Mk as the better authority for fact and chronology, perhaps because he knew it to be the earlier of the two. On the other hand he would soon discover that Mk, though an honest witness, is an uncouth writer; Mt. has the more polished pen. In some little points of idiom Lk., like other young writers, is punctilious but not quite easy.

Though even Mt. falls short of Lk.'s own intended level of narrative Greek, he may often give a useful hint how to paraphrase one of Mk's barbarisms. Lk.'s aim is to embody in his writing all that is precious in Mk and Mt., so far as it is fit to be offered to the larger, more critical, Hellenic world to which he himself belongs.

This criterion excludes the whole of Mt. 1, 2. What gentile cares for the mystic enumeration of generations, or the epochs it marks, in Mt. 1, 1-17? Mt. 1, 18-25 is certainly at the other end of the scale of interest, but not on that account more acceptable. We do not know whether the author of Lk.<sub>m</sub> had already heard of a strange and holy mystery encircling the birth of Jesus; but we do know, from our reading of the later prelude to his gospel, with what tender reverence, with what exaltation of soul, he would approach the thought. But how could he offer to a Greek reader such a story as Mt. tells? Joseph had reason to suspect his betrothed, but he was reassured by a dream; and this happened to fulfil an old oracle. So presented, the miracle can find no place in his work. The incidents in Mt. 2—the incredible massacre of children, the magic of Eastern wizards, the star over a stall, the flight into Egypt, the return and settlement at Nazareth; each of which is sanctioned by a chance assonance in some irrelevant prophecy—are equally inadmissible. Lk. seems, moreover, to have had some better information concerning the family of the Herods, which might in any case lead him to reject Mt. 2, 7-12 (just as he rejects Mk 6, 19-29). Therefore he passes over Mt. 1, 2, and begins Lk.<sub>m</sub> with the opening of Mk.

His first words are an unmistakable and sonorous exordium: *ἐν ἔτει πεντεκαιδεκάτῃ τῆς ἡγεμονίας Τιβερίου*



Καίσαρος, ἡγεμονεύοντος Ποντίου Πειλάτου τῆς Ἰουδαίας, καὶ τετραρχούντος τῆς Γαλιλαίας Ἡρώδου, Φιλίππου δὲ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ τετραρχούντος τῆς Ἰουραίας καὶ Τραχωνίτιδος χώρας, καὶ Λυσανίου τῆς Ἀβελιηνῆς τετραρχούντος, ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως Ἀννα, ἐγένετο ῥῆμα θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἰωάννῃ τὸν Ζαχαρίου υἱὸν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. The subsequent addition of Lk. 1, 2 at the revision, by displacing this solemn and resounding determination of time from the beginning of the gospel, leaves it disproportionately attached to the appearance of John, while the entrance of Jesus himself on his ministry is heralded by no such overture.

For the preaching of the Baptist, since Mk's account is so meagre (Mk 1, 4a, 7, 8), Lk. relies on Mt. Either now or at the revision he continues for a verse or two the prophecy cited by Mt. from Isaiah, since this context is still appropriate. The last phrase in Mt. 3, 5 may perhaps, through some damage to the roll, have been slightly misread by Lk., or he may have regarded its construction in Mt. as somewhat odd. "The whole region round the Jordan" can hardly be said to "go out" when it goes to the Jordan. Lk. transposes this phrase to an earlier place, saying that John appeared in the wilderness, and went through the whole region about the Jordan. In Lk. 3, 16 the ὕδατι without ἐν, the ἔρχεται and λύσαι τὸν ἱμάντα, come from Mk.

In the Baptism Lk. omits the notice Mt. 3, 14, 15, which is not in Mk, and in referring to baptism as a part of righteousness is probably alien to Lk.'s own feeling. The word ἀνεφχθῆναι and the important ἐπί for εἰς (Mk 1, 10; Mt. 3, 16; Lk. 3, 21) come from Mt.

So also in the Temptation Lk. followed the full

account in Mt.; and perhaps the chief deviations from this account (the inversion, and Lk. 4, 13*b* ἄχρι καιροῦ) came in later at the revision.

The next verse, Mk 1, 14*a*, 21*a*; Mt. 4, 12, 13, probably ran in Lk.<sub>m</sub> at first as follows: καὶ ἀκούσας ὅτι Ἰωάννης παρεδόθη ὑπέστρεψεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, καὶ καταλιπὼν τὴν Ναζαρά ἦλθεν εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ τὴν παραθαλάσσιον ἐν ὁρίοις Ζαβουλὼν καὶ Νεφθαλείμ, and the quotation from Isaiah in Mt. may also have been taken over.

At this point, for the first time, his two authorities diverge. Both Mk and Mt., it is true, speak in the next clause of the beginning of Jesus' ministry of teaching (Mk 1, 21*b*, 22; Mt. 4, 17), and while Mt. gives the substance of Jesus' message, Mk locates the preaching in the Capernaum synagogue. But the immediate sequel in Mk is a series of miracles, in Mt. the call of the first disciples. The first two miracles in Mk are dated by a preaching in the synagogue. Now Lk., of course, accepts from Mk the detail of the synagogue; and he rejects Mt. 4, 17*b* as a mere echo of Mt. 3, 1*b*, which he has already used as far as he can at Lk. 3, 3. (Lk. never accepts any words which seem to imply the speedy coming of the Kingdom of God.) It is clear, then, if he is to keep these Marcan miracles, that he must attach them, as Mk does, to the synagogue reference. Then he can do justice to Mt. by adding the call of the disciples. But first he will look forward a little in both rolls, to see whether Mt. recounts the miracles, or Mk the call. In Mk he finds that the near sequel contains a succession of narrative notices, but the call is not among them. In Mt. he discovers (1) that a reference to synagogue preaching, not merely at Capernaum but throughout Galilee, comes immediately after the call (Mt. 4, 23*a*);

(2) that an equally general ministry of healing is next spoken of (Mt. 4, 23*b*); (3) that a clause all but identical with the clause which, in Mk, *closes* the notice of the first miracle, follows this general healing in Mt.; (4) that this is followed by an account of other miracles of healing, in general terms indeed, but with evident reference to specific miracles (δαιμονιζομένους καὶ σεληνιαζομένους καὶ παραλυτικούς) (Mt. 4, 24); (5) that Mt. goes on to speak of crowds that come to Jesus from all quarters, on seeing whom Jesus ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος, and there addressed his disciples in a long discourse.

Lk. comes to the conclusion that at least the notice in Mk 1, 23–28, whose closing verse appears in Mt. 4, 24*a*, has been omitted by Mt.; that the summary in Mt. 4, 23*b*, and more especially that in Mt. 4, 24*b*, refer to the series of miracles in Mk, which include a δαιμονιζόμενος, a πυρέσσουσα, a λεπρός, a παραλυτικός in rapid succession; and that this summary implies omission of those miracles by Mt. In these inferences, except the last, Lk. was right, and though it is now easy to convict him of inadvertence in his third conclusion, yet if we worked with crabbed rolls, instead of with printed codices, we should hardly throw a stone at him<sup>1</sup>. What could lead him to think that Mt. would later insert severally most of the miracles which he had already disposed of, to all appearance, in an inclusive notice?

Since then, as Lk. conceives it, the difference between Mk and Mt. at this point consists simply in an omission by Mt., he will expect to find in Mk, when the matter omitted by Mt. has been traversed, the notice which

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps Lk.'s impression was not altogether mistaken. The point will be considered in a subsequent work.

appears next in Mt. Perhaps Lk. assumes this without further question. Perhaps however he is moved to unroll his copy of Mk and cast his eye down the columns in search of that notice. If so he discovers it (earlier, in my view, than our present text of Mk would suggest) at Mk 3, 13. The words in Mt. are: ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος· καὶ καθίσαντος αὐτοῦ προσῆλθαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς. The passage in Mk runs: ἀναβαίνει εἰς τὸ ὄρος· καὶ προσκαλεῖται οὓς ᾗθελεν αὐτός· καὶ ἐποίησεν δώδεκα ἵνα ἀποστέλλῃ αὐτοὺς [κηρύσσειν καὶ] ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν ἐκβάλλειν τὰ δαιμόνια· καὶ συνάγεται πρὸς αὐτὸν ὄχλος πλείστος· καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς. The beginning and close of these two pieces prove their substantial identity, and the ὄχλος πλείστος may perhaps be the same as the ὄχλοι πολλοί mentioned in the preceding verse in Mt. (4, 25). From Mk 1, 21 therefore as far as Mk 3, 13, 14, 15, 4, 1 *Lk. will be working on the text of Mk alone*, with no more help from Mt. than is afforded by the call and the summary notice, Mt. 4, 18–24.

[That Mt. 4, 23, 24 really is a summary of Marcan notices hardly needs demonstration: διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς is an induction from the Capernaum notice at this point in Mk and the later Nazareth notice, for the only places where teaching in synagogues is mentioned by either evangelist are Mk 1, 21 Mt. 4, 23; Mk 6, 2 Mt. 13, 53, and Mt. 9, 35 (where Mt. is led by the word περιῆγεν in Mk 6, 6 to repeat the whole of his own phrase from 4, 23 διδάσκων...μαλακίαν); the locution πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν, and the word μαλακία itself, only occur in this place, at the repetition of this verse Mt. 9, 35, and in their echo at Mt. 10, 1; so that this was their original position, and the phrase was coined expressly to condense

the Marcan notices of healing of disease; so also *καὶ βασάνοις συνεχομένους* (neither *βάσανος* as a noun nor the verb *συνέχειν* recurs in Mt. or Mk) is meant to cover those Marcan miracles in which the persons helped were not suffering from actual disease, but some other affliction. The phrase *ἡ ἀκοὴ αὐτοῦ* is confined to the equivalent verses Mk 1, 28; Mt. 4, 24a.]

At a later date, under circumstances which will be exhibited, Lk. omitted a part of what is now Lk. 4, 31, and in so doing left the pronoun *αὐτούς*, in *ἣν διδάσκων αὐτούς*, without definite reference. The question arises, to what did it originally refer? It can hardly be related, without some intervening phrase, to *τοῖς καθημένοις ἐν χώρᾳ καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου*. The answer may be that Lk. (either did not look forward in Mk for the equivalent of Mt. 5, 1, or, if he did so,) did not venture to identify the crowd in Mk, which came to Jesus *after* his ascent *εἰς τὸ ὄρος*, with the crowds in Mt. 4, 25, whose presence gave Jesus the occasion for that ascent. The plural form in Mt. suggested to Lk. (correctly, it would seem) that a number of crowds, characteristic of this period of Jesus' ministry, is meant: the word *ἠκολούθησαν* (despite the aorist construction) implies no less. Lk. would therefore understand Mt. 4, 25 as a part of the general notice Mt. 4, 23-25, and might very well insert it at once, to indicate the kind of audience Jesus had in his earliest period of teaching. If so Lk. wrote something like: *καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοὶ ἀπὸ πάσης τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Ἱερουσαλὴμ [καὶ Περαιάς?], καὶ ἦν διδάσκων αὐτούς ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν*. The omission of a reference to synagogues in this notice is thus explained. (See below, p. 58.)

Lk. then copies out from Mk, with only slight stylistic

changes, Mk 1, 22, the notice of the demoniac in the synagogue, and that of the healing of the *πενθερὰ Σίμωνος* immediately after Jesus left the synagogue. Next he takes occasion to insert from Mt. the call of Simon and the rest, with a preface that roughly corresponds to Mt.'s own preface Mt. 4, 17, coloured however by Mt. 4, 23. Then in order, from Mk only, he takes the notices of the leper, the paralytic, the eating with publicans and sinners, the three replies about fasting and the two notices about the sabbath-difficulty. This brings him to the point already reached in Mt., the *ἀναβαίνει εἰς τὸ ὄρος*.

§ 2. **Work on Mark (with touches derived from the summary in Matthew).**

In the earlier part of this paraphrase of Mk, Lk. is able to make considerable use of Mt. 4, 23, 24. The first instance of this might easily be overlooked, since it depends on a small point of grammatical usage<sup>1</sup>.

Although *τοῖς σάββασιν* and *ἦν διδάσκων αὐτούς* occur in two successive clauses of Mk (1, 21, 22), yet the sense in which the two phrases are combined in Lk. 4, 32 is not that of Mk, but is derived from Mt. 4, 23 *περιῆγεν .. διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς*, for it is a statement that Jesus made a habit of preaching on Sabbath days (scilicet, among other places (?), in synagogues), like that of Mt. that Jesus habitually preached in the synagogues (scilicet on Sabbaths). Perhaps it was a realisation of the fact that on the Sabbath Jesus would not be likely to preach anywhere except in a synagogue, where a great crowd could not find place, that induced Lk. on revision to omit the crowd, and so leave *αὐτούς* without definite reference.

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix II, on Luke's use of the Periphrastic Imperfect

[*τοῖς σάββασιν* is in Lk. (though not in Mk, and perhaps not in Mt.: see Mt. 12, 1) always plural in meaning. When Lk. wishes to date an incident on a (single) Sabbath he uses *τῷ σαββάτῳ*, or *τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων*, where *τὰ σάββατα* means "the week." (Contrast Lk. 6, 1 with Mk 2, 23; Mt. 12, 1, and Lk. 6, 7 with Mk 3, 2, where the use of *αὐτόν* shows that a particular occasion is meant; *δὶς τοῦ σαββάτου* Lk. 18, 12, "twice for a Sabbath," i.e. twice a week, is no exception. Lk. 13, 10, WH would certainly be an exception, but apart from other considerations the departure of *τοῖς σάββασιν* here from Lk.'s unvarying usage in the gospel and Acts points to the *τῷ σαββάτῳ* of D and its friends as the true reading.) The sense then of Lk. 4, 31 accords with that of Lk. 4, 44 *καὶ ἦν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς τῆς Ἰουδαίας*, Lk. 19, 47 *καὶ ἦν διδάσκων τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ*, Lk. 21, 37 *ἦν δὲ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων*, τὰς δὲ νύκτας κ.τ.λ. The habit of Jesus here referred to is not stated or implied by Mk before 1, 39.

*ἦν διδάσκων* Lk. 4, 32 is assuredly not the *ἦν διδάσκων* of Mk 1, 22 (= *ἦν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ* Lk. 4, 32). Lk. never accepts a periphrastic imperfect from Mk. The instances are: Mk 10, 22 Lk. 18, 23, Mk 14, 54 Lk. 22, 55, Mk 15 40 Lk. 23, 49, Mk 15, 43 Lk. 23, 51; to Mk 10, 32, 14, 4 there is no Lucan parallel.]

The second instance of Lk.'s use of Mt. 4, 23, 24 is also rather subtle, and may seem fanciful, but I believe it to be real. In Mk 1, 23 mention is made of *ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ*. Now both *πνεῦμα* and *ἀκάθαρτος* are current terms of the physician's art, but the combination of the two had not, so far as we know, a technical meaning.



It might stand for ἀκάθαρτος ἀήρ, for ὁσμή κακή, for offensive or obstructed breath caused by lung-complaint [ὁ τῶν πνευμάτων τῷ σώματι ταμίας ὁ πλεύμων Plato, *Tim.* 70 c] or for an obsession. Was Jesus dispelling a disease with a word, or exorcising a demon? It was not, in Lk.'s view, incredible that Jesus should say φимώθητι to a πνεῦμα μυχθῶδες, and cure an asthmatic by ordering the asthma to be gone. (Cf. ἐπετίμησεν τῷ πυρετῷ καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτήν Lk. 4, 39.) Mk is ambiguous. What is the subject of ἀνέκραξεν Mk 1, 23? What is the reference of αὐτῷ Mk 1, 25? (Was it a first impression that this αὐτῷ meant τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ that actually suggested to Lk. the phrase he uses at Lk. 4, 39?) Moreover the reading of D with Old Latin support at Mk 1, 26 καὶ ἐξῆλθεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον σπαράξας αὐτόν· καὶ κράξας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ is capable of meaning that when the πν. ἀκαθ. was gone the man showed his deliverance from it by giving forth a φωνὴ μεγάλη (no longer a πνεῦμα ἀραιόν). [The masculine participles in D may be original, not signs of reflex Latinism. Cf. Mk 5, 7 κράξας, 5, 12 λέγοντες, where D actually reads εἰπόντα.] It is therefore a relief to Lk. to be able to infer from Mt. 4, 24 δαιμονιζομένους that what is here in question is a δαιμόνιον. At its first appearance Lk. calls it an "unclean daemonic spirit," πνεῦμα δαιμόνιον ἀκάθαρτον Lk. 4, 33, at Lk. 4, 35 it is simply τὸ δαιμόνιον, and there can no longer be any ambiguity in τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις πνεύμασιν (Mk 1, 27) Lk. 4, 36.

At Mk 1, 28 Lk. betrays the influence of Mt. 4, 24 by a slight omission. Mk says that Jesus was heard of εἰς ὅλην τὴν περίχωρον τῆς Γαλιλαίας. Mt. makes the bolder statement εἰς ὅλην τὴν Συρίαν. Lk. neatly avoids

the too little and the too much by omitting Mk's last words. He writes (Lk. 4, 37) καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἡ ἀκοή αὐτοῦ εἰς πάντα τόπον τῆς περιχώρου, leaving us to define the extent of that region for ourselves.

After copying out in Lk. 4, 38a the substance of Mk 1, 29, Lk. adopts a slight refinement of language suggested by Mt. 4, 24. Instead of saying (with Mk 1, 30) κατέκειτο πυρέσσουσα, which means only "she had a temperature," Lk. uses the form ἦν συνεχόμενη πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ, "she was in the grip of a high fever." συνέχεσθαι in this sense is classical (with a general application, not as a technical term of medicine) but Lk., in his eight instances of this word, only twice more employs it thus: once with reminiscence of this passage at Acts 28, 8 πυρετοῖς καὶ δυσεντερίῳ συνεχόμενον, and once of fear, φόβῳ μεγάλῳ συνείχοντο Lk. 8, 37, where the μεγάλῳ again suggests reminiscence. (D, it is true, here reads κατεχομένη, a stronger expression, "overcome"; but without support, and perhaps by inadvertence.) The source of the phrase is obviously Mt. 4, 24, βασάνοις συνεχόμενοις.

[Harnack rashly asserts that "συνέχεσθαι is a technical term" of medicine (*Luke the Physician*, Eng. ed., p. 184, n. 3). If so, Herodotus, Thucydides, Plato and the Attic tragedians and comedians must be regarded as physicians, and such afflictions as perplexity, anxiety, fatigue, thirst, war, slavery and parental severity enter the category of disease.]

Finally, at the close of this first pair of Marcan miracles, and before inserting the general preaching and the call from Mt., Lk. gives, from Mt. 4, 24, the effect of Jesus' fame. The words of Mt. are προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας ποικίλαις νόσοις...καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν

αὐτούς. Lk. paraphrases (Lk. 4, 40) ἅπαντες ὅσοι εἶχον ἀσθενούντας νόσοις ποικίλαις ἤγαγον αὐτοὺς πρὸς αὐτόν, ὁ δὲ...ἐθεράπευεν [or ἐθεράπευσεν **NC**] αὐτούς. (This "and he healed them" is a purely Matthaean ending, recurring at Mt. 15, 30 and 21, 14, but never in any other gospel, except here.)

[As we accompany Lk. in his progress through the compilation of Lk.<sub>m</sub> we shall be brought into contact with these sections again.]

Lk. has now reached the point at which he can resume work on Mt., since the ascent εἰς τὸ ὄρος has been overtaken in Mk. What stands in Lk.<sub>m</sub> up to this point is the original state of:

Lk. 3, 1-9, 16<sup>b</sup> (ἐγώ)-17, 21, 22; 4, 1-14<sup>a</sup> (Γαλιλαίαν), 31-39, 40<sup>b</sup> (ἅπαντες...ἐθεράπευεν αὐτούς), 44. A notice of the Call of the First Disciples, ending at 5, 10, 11; 5, 12-14, 18-20<sup>a</sup> (εἶπεν), 24<sup>b</sup> (τῷ)-25, (29-32?), 33-38; 6, 1-11.

As soon as Lk. examines the context of the ἀνάβασις εἰς τὸ ὄρος he perceives that he is not yet able to begin working on Mk and Mt. together. Three things appear:

(1) That the crowd from which Jesus withdrew, according to Mt., cannot be identified with the crowd which, according to Mk, collected about him after his ascent; but it is extremely natural that, after his chosen disciples had come to him—at his own call, as Mk relates—a large number of "disciples" in a less strict sense should also seek him.

(2) That Jesus, according to Mk, appointed twelve who were to be sent out to minister as teachers and healers.

(3) That the discourse which follows in Mk, addressed to the ὄχλος πλείστος, is quite different from that which follows in Mt., addressed to οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.

Moreover, whatever Mk may have meant by τὸ ὄρος, Lk. evidently takes it to mean a mountain, presumptively some particular mountain in the neighbourhood of Capernaum.

These data can hardly be combined otherwise than as Lk. combined them: Jesus, avoiding the crowd, ascended a lonely hill, where, at his own summons, he was attended by disciples only, whom he addressed as disciples; then, descending to a place which would accommodate a larger audience, he gave a discourse to the multitude. So Lk. wrote:

ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις ἐξελθεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ ὄρος· καὶ ἐφώνησεν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ [λέγων...] καὶ ἐκλεξάμενος ἀπὸ [τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ] δώδεκα, καὶ καταβὰς μετ' αὐτῶν, ἔστη ἐπὶ τόπου πεδινοῦ· καὶ πλῆθος πολὺ [συνάγεται πρὸς αὐτὸν] ἀπὸ πάσης Ἰουδαίας καὶ ἄλλων πόλεων ἐληλυθότων ἀκούσαι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἰαθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν νόσων αὐτῶν· καὶ οἱ ὄχλούμενοι ἀπὸ πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων ἐθεραπεύοντο· καὶ ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ εἰς [αὐτοὺς] ἔλεγεν....

Into this framework the two discourses were to be fitted, that from Mt. after λέγων, that from Mk after ἔλεγεν. (The description of the crowd and its desires comes from Mt. 4, 24b, 25; the healing implied in one clause, and the exorcism narrated in the next, are derived from Mt. 4, 23, 24.)

Before considering the detail of Lk.'s work upon Mt. alone, a summary account of it may conveniently be given. Lk. either assumes (correctly) that he will find the Marcan discourse (the Sower, and sequel) at a later point in Mt., or else he is led, somewhere in the progress of this piece of work, to search for it and find it. (The assumption would

be confirmed as soon as Lk. found that Mt., in Mt. 8, 1 sqq., was covering ground already traversed by Mk.) In any case Lk. deals now with all of Mt. that precedes the Sower, i.e. Mt. 5-12.

### § 3. **Work on Matthew alone.**

First comes the Sermon on the Mount. Lk.'s treatment of it is governed by four main considerations: (1) The discourse is very long in Mt., and on the face of it a compilation. It cannot be regarded as a simple report of one address. There is therefore no literary reason against shortening it by the omission or transference of certain sections. (2) Lk. is desirous, here and always, to write *καθεξῆς*, in a connected and sequential manner. (3) The occasion of the address, as Lk. conceives it, is that Jesus is giving an initial charge to a select inner circle of disciples, some of whom, at least, are being ordained to a ministry. All that cannot find place in such a charge must be passed over or deferred. (4) Portions of the Matthaean sermon are meant for Jews of Palestine, and presuppose Jewish conditions. For the purpose of Lk.'s gospel these are inadmissible.

After the Sermon Lk. goes consecutively through the notices and discourses that follow in Mt. The Marcan notices which he has already used are revised in the light of the Matthaean version, but left in the places which they hold *before* the Sermon. At the close of Lk.'s sequence of Matthaean matter he forms into a second sequence as much as possible of the valuable matter which his *καθεξῆς* principle has led him to defer.

The disposition of this matter with relation to Lk.'s Marcan transcript was determined by certain parallels

existing between passages in this sequence and certain Marcan passages which appear *after* that point in Mk at which Lk. has paused for his examination of Mt. A decisively important parallel is that of Mk 6, 7 with Mt. 10, 1.

The Sermon, in Lk., ran much as follows:

Mt. 5, 3	Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί, ὅτι ὑμετέρα ἐστὶν ἡ	Lk. 6,
6	βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. μακάριοι οἱ πεινῶντες νῦν,	20. 21
11	ὅτι χορτασθήσεσθε. μακάριοί ἐστε ὅταν μισή- 22	
	σωσιν ὑμᾶς οἱ ἄνθρωποι καὶ ὅταν ἀφορίσωσιν	
12	καὶ ὀνειδίσωσιν καὶ ἐκβάλωσιν τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν	23
	ὡς πονηρὸν ἔνεκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου· χάρητε	
	ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ σκιρτήσατε, ὅτι ὁ μισθὸς	
	ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς· κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ	
44	ἐποιοῦν τοῖς προφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν. ἀλλὰ 27	
	ὑμῖν λέγω τοῖς ἀκούουσιν, ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς	
	ὑμῶν, καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς, εὐλογεῖτε 28	
	τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς, προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν	
39b	ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς, τῷ τύποντί σε εἰς τὴν σια- 29	
40	γόνα παρέχε αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ	
	αἵροντός σου τὸ ἱμάτιον καὶ τὸν χιτῶνα μὴ	
42	κωλύσης, παντὶ δὲ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου, καὶ ἀπὸ 30	
46	τοῦ αἵροντος τὰ σὰ μὴ ἀπαίτει. καὶ εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε 32	
	τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, ποία ὑμῶν χάρις ἐστίν;	
47	καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ τοῦτο ποιοῦσιν· καὶ εἰ ἀγα- 33	
	θοποιεῖτε τοὺς ἀγαθοποιούντας ὑμᾶς, ποία ὑμῖν	
	χάρις ἐστίν; καὶ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ τοῦτο ποιοῦσιν.	
(44b &) 45	πλὴν ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν καὶ ἀγαθο- 35	
	ποιεῖτε, καὶ ἔσεσθε υἱοὶ Ὑψίστου, ὅτι αὐτὸς	
	χρηστός ἐστιν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀχαρίστους καὶ πονηροὺς.	
48	γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες καθὼς καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν 36	
7, 1	οἰκτίρμων ἐστίν. μὴ κρίνετε, ἵνα μὴ κριθήτε· 37a	

- Mt. 7, 2b. 3 ὃ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν. τί δὲ Lk. 6, 38b.  
βλέπετε τὸ κάρφος ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ  
σου, τὴν δὲ δοκὸν τὴν ἐν τῷ σῷ ὀφθαλμῷ οὐ  
4 κατανοεῖς; ἢ πῶς δύνασαι λέγειν τῷ ἀδελφῷ 42  
σου, ἄφες ἐκβάλλω τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ  
σου, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἡ δοκὸς ἐν τῷ σῷ ὀφθαλμῷ ὑπό-  
5 κείται; ὑπὸ κριτά, ἔκβαλε πρῶτον τὴν δοκὸν ἐκ  
τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου, καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις τὸ κάρφος  
ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου ἐκβαλεῖν.  
ἕκαστον δένδρον ἐκ τοῦ καρποῦ αὐτοῦ γινώσκεται.  
16 οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἀκανθῶν ἐκλέγονται σῦκα, οὐδὲ ἐκ 44  
17 & 18 βάτου σταφυλὴν τρυγῶσιν. οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν δέν- 43  
δρον καλὸν ποιοῦν καρποὺς σαπρούς, οὐδὲ πάλιν  
21 δένδρον σαπρὸν ποιοῦν καρποὺς καλοὺς. τί δέ 46  
με λέγετε Κύριε, κύριε, καὶ οὐ ποιεῖτε ἃ λέγω;  
24 πᾶς ὁ ἐρχόμενος πρὸς με καὶ ἀκούων μου τῶν 47  
λόγων καὶ ποιῶν αὐτούς, ὑποδείξω ὑμῖν τίνι  
ἐστὶν ὅμοιος· ὅμοιός ἐστιν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδομοῦντι 48  
οἰκίαν, ὃς ἔσκαψεν καὶ ἐβάθυνεν καὶ ἔθηκεν θεμέ-  
25 λιον ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν· πλημύρας δὲ γενομένης προσέ-  
ρηξεν ὁ ποταμὸς τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσεν  
σαλεῦσαι αὐτήν, τεθεμελίωτο γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν.  
26 ὁ δὲ ἀκούσας καὶ μὴ ποιήσας ὅμοιός ἐστιν ἀν- 49  
θρώπῳ οἰκοδομήσαντι οἰκίαν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν χωρὶς  
27 θεμελίου· συνπροσέρηξεν ὁ ποταμός, καὶ συνέ-  
πεσεν, καὶ ἐγένετο τὸ ῥῆγμα τῆς οἰκίας ἐκείνης  
μέγα.

It will be observed that the course of thought in this discourse is perfectly clear and fluent, and profoundly fit for a first address to chosen disciples: "Blessed are ye in your acceptance of the kingdom of God; blessed in your



sufferings and persecutions; yet more blessed if ye repay your persecutors good for evil; most blessed if ye are kind to all men, even in thought. Therefore judge not others<sup>1</sup>, but let each look to his own faults, for by his own fruits must each be judged. Fruits are deeds, not professions: not they that hail me as Lord, but they that do what I teach, are founded on a rock."

Almost all the passages in Mt.'s Sermon that Lk. absolutely discards are those which are unfitted for a writing intended for gentile readers, namely the pieces which criticise the Jewish Law, Mt. 5, 17-20 (but 5, 18, perhaps because of its astonishing character, remains at least in Lk.'s memory), 5, 21-24, 27-31, 33-38, 43, and those that denounce practices peculiar to Jewish cities, Mt. 6, 2-8, 16-18. Outside these sections and the omitted beatitudes (see below) only nine verses remain ultimately unused by Lk., namely 5, 16 and 6, 1, rejected perhaps because they present an apparent mutual contradiction; 6, 14, 15, which are open to objection as legalistic, and as limiting God's will to forgive; 6, 34, which is superfluous, and somewhat odd in its phrasing; 7, 6, which again is surprisingly worded; 7, 15, which will not accommodate itself to the use Lk. makes of the sequel, and is, when isolated, of less value than other sayings of Jesus; and 7, 19, 20, both members of which have already been used by Lk.

The verses which Lk. is not able to work into his sequence, but wishes to use elsewhere, are Mt. 5, 13-15, 18?, 25, 26, 32; 6, 9-13; 6, 20-33; 7, 7-14, 22, 23. Reference to these verses and to Lk.'s version of the Sermon will

<sup>1</sup> A remarkable parallel to this thought occurs in Gal. 6, 1-5.

show their unfitness for a place in it. Lk. takes note of these analecta for future use.

A few observations may be made about the text of the Sermon in Lk. In Lk.<sub>m</sub> the evangelist seems to have retained only two of the general beatitudes, Mt. 5, 3-10. The last of these may have been omitted on stylistic grounds, as unnecessary in view of Mt. 5, 11, 12; Lk. 6, 22, 23. The three ethical blessings which precede it, and the transcript from Ps. 37 at Mt. 5, 5, fall out in order to make clear that Jesus (as Lk. conceives) is blessing his auditors, the chosen disciples. For a similar reason Lk. omitted Mt. 5, 4; poverty and hunger might be predicated of those hearers of Jesus, but not mourning. [At the revision Lk. inserted a modified form of this saying, Lk. 6, 21*b*; for tears might be attributed to the disciples, tears of deep emotion, but not of grief.] It is possible that the change to the second person was not made till the revision, for the old Syriac, with old Latin support, gives Lk. 6, 20*b*, 21 in the third person. [If so, it was this change which made Lk. 6, 21*b* admissible, in his sense.] Lk.'s omission of τῷ πνεύματι from Mt. 5, 3; Lk. 6, 20*b* is determined by his knowledge of the passage on which both Mt. 5, 3 and Mt. 5, 4 are founded, Isaiah 61, 1 sq. (see Lk. 4, 18, 19), where πτωχοῖς occurs simply, without τῷ πνεύματι. The change of τῶν οὐρανῶν into τοῦ θεοῦ [perhaps made first at the revision] is in accordance with Lk.'s usual practice.

In Lk.'s version of Mt. 5, 12, at Lk. 6, 23, the true reading is probably τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (so B with Old Latin support) instead of τῷ οὐρανῷ (WH).

[Lk. uses οὐρανός of the sky, οὐρανοί in a mystic, meta-

phorical sense, without connoting any definite physical idea. In his usage ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς means "in the highest sense, in the sight of God," or the like. (With μισθὸς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς cf. θησαυρὸν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς Lk. 12, 33; 18, 22.) Lk. shrinks from the thought of the sky as the dwelling-place of God and his angels, and always alters his source to eliminate it. Thus Mk 12, 25 ὡς ἄγγελοι ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, Mt. 22, 30 ὡς ἄγγελοι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ becomes in Lk. 20, 36 ἰσάγγελοι, a coinage *ad hoc*. Mk 11, 25 ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, Mt. 6, 14 ὁ π. ὁ οὐράνιος and Mk 13, 32 οἱ ἄγγελοι ἐν οὐρανῷ, Mt. 24, 36 οἱ ἀ. τῶν οὐρανῶν are omitted by Lk. altogether. For Mt.'s βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν Lk. substitutes βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. The phrase ὁ πατὴρ [ὑμῶν ὁ] ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, or an oblique case of the same, occurs at Mt. 5, 45, where Lk. 6, 35 has ὑψίστου, at Mt. 6, 9, where Lk. 11, 2 has πάτερ, at Mt. 7, 11, where Lk. 11, 13 quite turns the sense by writing ἐξ οὐρανοῦ δώσει<sup>1</sup>, at Mt. 7, 21, where for τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς Lk. 6, 46 writes ἀ λέγω, and at Mt. 10, 32, 33, where Lk. 12, 8 has ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ and ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀ. τ. θ. Moreover the phrase at Mt. 5, 16 is omitted by Lk. after 8, 16 and 11, 33, ὁ οὐράνιος at Mt. 5, 48 is omitted from Lk. 6, 36, and the whole clause containing ὁ π. ὁ οὐράνιος at Mt. 23, 9 is omitted from the context of Lk. 11, 43 and 20, 46. (Mt. 5, 34 and Mt. 6, 1 do not appear in Lk.) Lk. 8, 21 reads τοῦ θεοῦ [with Mk 3, 35, which is however probably secondary], rejecting τοῦ π. μου τ. ἐν οὐρανοῖς written by Mt. 12, 50. To Mt. 16, 17; 18, 10, 19 Lk. has no parallels. In fact Lk. never accepts either from Mk or from Mt. a phrase which represents οἱ οὐρανοί as the residence of God.

<sup>1</sup> A spiritualising allusion to Ex. 16, 4, anticipating John 6, 31 sqq.

There are however in Lk.'s peculiar matter—apart from Lk. 1, 2—two places where οὐρανός is used in the singular in an especial sense. They are Lk. 15, 7 *χαρὰ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἔσται* and Lk. 15, 18, 21 *ἡμαρτον εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν*. These assimilate themselves with Lk. 11, 13 *ἐξ οὐρανοῦ δώσει πνεῦμα ἅγιον*, and just as this passage accords with Acts 2, 1-4, so Lk. 15, 7 accords with Lk. 2, 13-15. Lk. must have heard of the gift of the πνεῦμα ἅγιον before he heard the Lucan birth-stories, so that these several affinities do not contradict the view that Lk. 15, 7-9, 11-32 belong to the revision, and not to Lk.<sub>m</sub>.]

The words *τοῖς ἀκούουσιν* added by Lk. 6, 27 to Mt. 5, 44 are a clear sign of secondariness. The imperative *ἀγαπᾶτε* would be too abrupt a beginning of the new clause: some slight introductory phrase is needed, and Lk. takes the *λέγω ὑμῖν* of Mt. as the nearest at hand; but in Mt. the connotation of *ὑμῖν* is determined by *ἐγὼ δέ*, which is motivated by Mt. 5, 43, a passage that drops out like Mt. 5, 21, 27, 31 and 38. Lk. therefore displaces *ἐγὼ δέ* by *ἀλλά*, and justifies *ὑμῖν* by *τοῖς ἀκούουσιν*, i.e. in effect "my disciples." (Cf. Lk. 10, 16 *ὁ ἀκούων ὑμῶν ἐμοῦ ἀκούει*.) The addition of *καλῶς κ.τ.λ.* is intended to balance the threefold persecution described in the beatitude above: *τοῖς μισοῦσιν* corresponds to *μισήσουσιν, καταρωμένους* to *ἀφορίσωσιν καὶ ὀνειδίσωσιν, ἐπηρεάζοντων* to *ἐκβάλωσιν τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν*.

The suppression of Mt. 5, 41 is a literary improvement, since the idea is already better expressed in Mt. 5, 40. The form of Mt. 5, 47 is changed at Lk. 6, 33 to accord with what precedes: there has been no mention of greeting, but love and kind deeds have been successively dwelt on.

No part of Mt. 6 being suited to this discourse, Lk.

contrives an admirable link between Mt. 5, 48 and Mt. 7, 1, by placing Mt. 5, 45 immediately before Mt. 5, 48, and writing *οἰκτίρμων* for the less definite *τέλειος* of Mt. (Lk. 6, 36).

Mt. 7, 12 is passed over, we may suppose, because the note here struck is not so high as that already sounded, "Love your enemies." Perhaps the verse was at once placed in its present position at Lk. 6, 31, but Lk.'s treatment of the rest of the omitted passages that he afterwards used tells against that supposition.

An ingenious use is made of Mt. 7, 16-18: a new (but certainly legitimate) turn is given to it. Instead of "judge men by their works" it is made to say "take care of your *own* works, for they are the real criterion" (Lk. 6, 44, 43). [Very possibly Lk. wrote here *ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ αὐτοῦ γνωσθήσεται*, and altered the tense under the influence of Mt. 12, 33, when that passage was reached and accommodated to this context. See below, p. 87.]

Mt. 7, 21 could not be used in its Matthaean form. In that form it is closely connected with Mt. 7, 22, 23, which refer to "that day," and are foreign to such a charge as Jesus (in Lk.) is here giving. And, beyond that, in connexion with those verses Mt. 7, 21 suggests that the Parusia will date the beginning of the *βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν*, a doctrine which Lk. does not share. (Lk. 17, 21 *ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστίν*.) Yet again the phrase *τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* is doubly offensive to Lk. Not only does he refuse to regard heaven as God's home; he never speaks of *τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ* as that which God *enjoins* or *desires* (namely, righteousness) but always as that which God *decrees*.

[Lk. 12, 47 associates itself with Acts 22, 14: the distinction is not between knowing what is right or wrong and being morally defective, but between knowing what the master has decreed, so that one may act *πρὸς τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ*, and being ignorant of that decree. Lk. 22, 42 associates itself with Acts 21, 14: in what is seen to be inevitable a decree of God is recognised, to which the pious soul must bow: *μὴ πειθομένον δὲ αὐτοῦ ἡσυχάσαμεν εἰπόντες Τοῦ κυρίου τὸ θέλημα γινέσθω*. So also Jesus in Lk. 22, 42 is not submitting a vicious impulse to the power of righteousness, but submitting his life to a special decree of God his Father.—Accordingly, Lk. will never accept *θέλημα θεοῦ* or the like as a synonym for righteousness from Mk or Mt. Mk 3, 35 *τὸ θ. τ. θ.*, Mt. 12, 50 *το θ. τ. πατρός μου τ. ἐν οὐρανοῖς* becomes in Lk. 12, 21 *τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ*. Mt. 6, 10b *γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς* drops out of the Paternoster in Lk. 11, 2, for the plain meaning is “may men become as obedient as angels.” Mt. 18, 14 would imply, in Lk.’s sense, a Universalist doctrine, for which reason, perhaps, he omits it, and gives another ending to the parable, Lk. 15, 7. Mt. 21, 31 seems cardinal in the section Mt. 21, 28–31, so that it is natural enough that this parable does not appear (in this form at least) in Lk. Mt. 26, 42 is the verse which Lk. has combined with Mk 14, 36; Mt. 26, 39 in Lk. 22, 42: here the word is used in Lk.’s own sense.]

And, besides, the necessary exclusion of Mt. 7, 22, 23 from Lk.’s discourse left Mt. 7, 21 in contact with Mt. 7, 24 *πᾶς οὖν ὅστις ἀκούει μου τοὺς λόγους τούτους καὶ ποιεῖ*, leading on to Mt. 7, 26, *πᾶς ὁ ἀκούων...καὶ μὴ ποιῶν*, so that the actual form which Lk. 6, 46 gives to Mt. 7, 21 is almost dictated by the context.

The Lucan form of Mt. 7, 24-27 betrays its secondariness by retaining in Lk. 6, 48 ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν from Mt. 7, 24, although the antithesis to ἐπὶ τὴν ἄμμον has vanished; in Lk. the antithesis is between ἔθηκεν θεμέλιον and χωρὶς θεμελίου.

Lk. recognises Mt. 7, 28b, 29 as a piece which he has already used (at Lk. 4, 32 = Mk 1, 22), but he adopts Mt. 7, 28a, which is new, as a transition to the narrative that follows.

Mt. 8, 1-4 however is the first of a series of what may conveniently be called A-pieces, that is to say pieces which Lk., in his work on Mt., recognises as having already found a place in his Marcan paraphrase. These he re-touches, in the light of the shorter Matthaean version; but he leaves them where they stand, earlier in Lk.<sub>m</sub>.

Accordingly Lk.'s introduction to the Centurion notice, which comes next in Mt., runs thus: καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα λαλῶν ἦλθεν εἰς Καφαρναούμ.

The text of the story itself in Lk.<sub>m</sub> seems to have been much as follows (the only words which do not occur in canonical Lk. in the form here given are marked by square brackets):

[ἐκατοντάρχης δέ τις προσελθὼν παρεκάλει αὐτὸν λέγων Κύριε, ὁ παῖς μου κακῶς ἔχει καὶ μέλλει ἀποθνήσκειν. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἐγὼ ἐλθὼν θεραπεύσω αὐτόν. ἀπεκρίθη δὲ] ὁ ἐκατοντάρχης λέγων αὐτῷ Κύριε, οὐκ εἰμὶ ἰκανὸς ἵνα ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην μου εἰσέλθῃς· ἀλλὰ εἰπὲ λόγῳ καὶ ἰαθήσεται ὁ παῖς μου· καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος εἰμὶ ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν τασσόμενος, ἔχων ὑπ' ἐμαυτὸν στρατιώτας, καὶ λέγω τούτῳ Πορεύου, καὶ πορεύεται, καὶ ἄλλῳ Ἐρχου, καὶ ἔρχεται, καὶ τῷ δούλῳ μου Ποίησον



τοῦτο, καὶ ποιεῖ. ἀκούσας δὲ ταῦτα ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐθαύμασεν, καὶ στραφεὶς τῷ ἀκολουθοῦντι ὄχλῳ εἶπεν Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐδέποτε ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ τοιαύτην πίστιν εἶδρον. [καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ ἑκατοντάρχῃ Ὑπαγε, ὡς ἐπίστευσας γεννηθήτω σοι.] καὶ ὑποστρέψ[ας] εἰς οἶκον [ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ] εὗρ[εν] τὸν ἀσθενοῦντα [παῖδα] ὑγιαίνοντα.

[The version now found in canonical Lk. 7, 1-10 has affinities with the account of Cornelius in Acts 10, 11 (cf. especially Lk. 7, 3, 5, 6 with Acts 10, 2, 4, 5, 22; Acts 10, 25 may be reminiscent of Lk. 7, 6, 7). Probably the Cornelius story was already known to Lk. when he extended this notice. For it is apparent that it was Lk. that extended, not Mt. that abbreviated, the narrative. (The story in Mt. presents no difficulty. In Lk. the centurion is now made to summon Jesus as far as to his door, and then to suggest that Jesus need not enter. The reasons given in Lk. 7, 6 b-8 would be good reasons for not taking the course described in Lk. 7, 3 (ἀπέστειλεν... ἐρωτῶν αὐτὸν ὅπως ἐλθὼν διασώσῃ τὸν δοῦλον) but are very bad reasons for asking Jesus to come, and denying him admittance when he comes. The grotesque suggestion underlying Lk. 7, 7a is that a greater degree of self-esteem is needed to come as a suppliant to Jesus than to summon Jesus to come to the suppliant.)

The language of the additions in Lk. is relatively late: *μακρὰν* occurs three times in Acts, but only once more in the gospel, namely in this same phrase *μακρὰν ἀπέχοντος* in a peculiar parable at Lk. 15, 20; *ἡξίωσα* in this sense and construction is Pauline (cf. 2 Thess. 1, 11) and, though used in a comparable way in Acts 15, 38, the verb does not recur in this gospel; *σπουδαῖος* and *σπουδαίως* are Pauline, and neither recurs in any gospel; *τὸ ἔθνος*, of the Jews,

occurs often in Acts, but in Lk.'s gospel only here and in the peculiar verse Lk. 23, 2.]

I assume that Lk. wrote *παῖς* in copying Mt. 8, 6 as in Mt. 8, 8 (the *δοῦλος* introduced into the later additions, perhaps by a suggestion hastily caught from Lk. 7, 8c, was substituted for this *παῖς*, but that in Lk. 7, 7b escaped notice); that *ἀποθνήσκειν* was written in Lk. 7, 2, for *τελευτᾶν* in later Lucan (twice in Acts, not elsewhere in Lk.); and that *μὴ σκίλλου* was a later addition, reminiscent of Mk. 5, 35; Lk. 8, 49.

An extraordinary interest attaches to the *Matthæan* text of Mt. 8, 13. It may be best approached by a consideration of Lk. 7, 10. Why has Lk. substituted this verse for the *καὶ ἰάθη ὁ παῖς ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐκείνῃ* of his original? What he now says is less incisive, and has no obvious advantage over the other notice. We are not interested in those *πεμφθέντες*, whether they were *δοῦλοι* or *φίλοι*, but in the centurion himself and his lad. To tell us "the lad was healed" or "the master had his faith rewarded by seeing the lad restored" would be much more natural than to bring in this superfluous reference to the messengers. We are led to surmise that this verse did not issue as a whole *aus einem Gusse*. It is an adaptation, to the new version of the story, of a verse which stood in the old version, and was there admirably in place: *καὶ ὑποστρέψας εἰς [τὸν?] οἶκον [αὐτοῦ?] ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ εὗρεν τὸν ἀσθενοῦντα [παῖδα?] ὑγιαίνοντα*.

This is distinctively Lucan language. (*ὑγιαίνων* occurs also Lk. 5, 31; 15, 27, but never in any other gospel.—*αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ* occurs Lk. 2, 38; 10, 21; 12, 12; 20, 19; 24, 33; Acts 16, 18; 22, 13; *αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ* occurs Lk. 13, 31; 23, 12; 24, 13; *αὐτῷ τῷ καιρῷ* Lk. 13, 1; but none of

these phrases occurs in any other gospel.—Even *ὑποστρέφειν εἰς τὸν οἶκον*, while it recurs three times in Lk, is not used by the other evangelists.) Nevertheless this passage, with the addition of *ὁ ἐκατόνταρχος*, is read by **ℵ**, C, several other uncials and one Old Latin codex in Mt. 8, 13. It is so intolerably awkward and superfluous after *καὶ ἰάθη ὁ παῖς κ.τ.λ.* that the pen of a second scribe has struck it out, both in **ℵ** and C; and this accounts for its absence from other MSS. of the first rank. Nor is this all. An equally Lucan (though not so peculiarly Lucan) passage, which comes *before* instead of after the Matthaean phrase *καὶ ἰάθη κ.τ.λ.*, has actually remained a part of the received text of Mt.: *καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ ἐκατοντάρχη "Ὑπαγε, ὥς ἐπίστευσας γενηθήτω σοι.* [Here the one unequivocally Lucan word is *ἐκατοντάρχη*, for Mt. uses *ἐκατόνταρχος* both in this notice and at Mt. 27, 54. Though the implication of the words *ὥς ἐπίστευσας κ.τ.λ.* is characteristic of Lk., it is not peculiar to him. He may have inserted it here when, a little later, he found reason to omit from his gospel the *δύο τυφλοί* notice of Mt. This phrase (*κατὰ τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν γενηθήτω ὑμῖν*) was then saved and attached to this narrative. See below, p. 106.]

It appears then that the text of Mt. as it stands in **ℵ** is a conflation of two separate and alternative passages (after *βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων*). The one reads:

*καὶ ἰάθη ὁ παῖς ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐκείνῃ.*

The other reads:

*καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ ἐκατοντάρχη "Ὑπαγε, ὥς ἐπίστευσας γενηθήτω σοι. καὶ ὑποστρέψας [ὁ ἐκατόνταρχος] εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ εὗρεν τὸν παῖδα ὑγιαίνοντα.*

The only explanation of the first seems to be that it is the original Matthaean text. Whence came the second reading into a very early copy of Mt.? There can be but one answer: the language is markedly and distinctively Lucan; we know of no third version of the Centurion's Servant; the source must be Lk. But in the revised Lk., with the peculiar matter, it is no longer read. It seems that we are compelled to infer that the earlier version Lk.<sub>m</sub>, the gospel based on Mk and Mt. without the peculiar additions, not only existed for a term of years (as the differences in vocabulary show) before being extended, but was circulated so widely that it exerted an influence, in the scriptorium, on the text of Mt.

(It is to be noted that the mention of the Centurion in this conclusion was unnecessary in Lk. It became necessary in Mt. because of the retention of the Matthaean ending between the two members of the Lucan ending, and was therefore inserted by the scribe in the Matthaean form, *ὁ ἑκατόνταρχος*. If it had stood in Lk. we should presumptively find it in the form *ἑκατοντάρχης*, as in the preceding clause.—In the revised Lk. the corresponding phrase *οἱ πεμφθέντες* does not stand before but after *εἰς τὸν οἶκον*; and in the other occurrences in Lk. *ὑποστρ. εἰς τὸν οἶκον* is a solid phrase.)

Mt. 8, 11, 12 is perceived by Lk. to be intrusive in this notice. Hitherto the crowd has been spoken of as eager to hear Jesus, and only the Pharisees (Mk 3, 6; Lk. 6, 11) have been hostile to him. These words are therefore not appropriate in an address to the crowd. Lk. reserves them among his *analecta*.

Mt. 8, 14, 15 is an A-piece (Mk 1, 29–31; Lk. 4, 38, 39),

but the additional fact of the general healing, which Mt. appends to the *πενθερὰ Σίμωνος* notice at Mt. 8, 16, 17, is new. Lk. therefore adds it to his Marcan notice, Lk. 4, 40, 41*a*. (He omits, as ill applied, the citation of Isaiah, Mt. 8, 17.) It so happens that Lk. finds already in place in his work the equivalent of Mt. 8, 16*b*, *καὶ πάντας...ἐθεράπευσεν* (see above, p. 61), and he has therefore only to add a paraphrase of Mt. 8, 16*a, c*. It thus comes about that the healing and the exorcism stand in inverted order in Mt. and Lk. The note of time, *ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης* in Mt., must of necessity come before the *ἅπαντες ὅσοι κ.τ.λ.* in Lk. (displacing any copula which already stood there); but since Lk. never uses *ὀψέ*, *ὄψιος* or *ὀψία* he adopts the synonymous phrase *δύνοντος δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου*.

Lk. cannot however leave this passage as it now stands, for immediately after a notice of a general healing at sunset comes a brief statement of a preaching tour which Jesus made, and then the story of the Call of Simon. Some words of transition are necessary. The first words may naturally be *γενομένης δὲ ἡμέρας*. For the rest he takes a hint from the next words in Mt. (8, 18), which speak of Jesus avoiding a crowd, and another from his recollection of that Matthaean summary which was recently so much in his thought. Mt. 4, 23 speaks of Jesus preaching the gospel of the kingdom in the synagogues throughout Galilee. Lk. writes therefore the substance of Lk. 4, 42, 43. (The language was probably retouched at the revision.)

Lk. proceeds with his transcript of Mt., 8, 18–8, 34, and writes for Mt. 9, 1 *αὐτὸς δὲ ἐμβαὲς εἰς πλοῖον ὑπέστρεψεν, καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν πόλιν*—when he recognises the healing of the paralytic as an A-piece (Mk 2, 3–5, 11, 12).

This makes clear that ἡ ἰδία πόλις is Capernaum, since Capernaum is implicitly the scene of the miracle in Mk. After the notices which Lk. has introduced between the *πενθερὰ Σίμωνος* and this narrative it is necessary to name the city again, so Lk. writes (at the close of the Leper) καὶ ἦλθεν πάλιν εἰς Καφαρναούμ before the beginning of his Marcan notice. He not only adds a few Matthaean touches to his transcript from Mk, but introduces from Mt. the whole episode of the rebuke of the Scribes.

It is to be observed that αὐτὸς δὲ ἐμβὰς εἰς πλοῖον ὑπέστρεψεν now forms the conclusion of the Gadarene notice in Lk.<sub>m</sub>.

The next notice in Mt. is the Call of Matthew. This seems to have been one of the places where the copy of Mt. which Lk. was using was so badly frayed as to be only imperfectly legible. Enough can be made out to reconstruct the text so long as each word is a clue to both its neighbours, but in the cardinal word of the notice, the proper name, this source of light necessarily fails. What had been partly obliterated was: ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝΛΕΓΟΜΕΝΟΝ  
certain letters and strokes remained:

Α ΘΑΙΟΝΛΕΙ'CIIICNON

and Lk. read these thus:

ΑΛΦΑΙΟΥΛΕΥΕΙΝΟΝΟΜΑΤΙ

Ἀλφαίου Λευεῖν must stand for Λευεῖν τὸν τοῦ Ἀλφαίου, words which Lk., confident of having correctly interpreted the damaged writing, inserts in his transcript—thus providing a puzzle for future harmonists.

There is nothing to let us know certainly whether the next Matthaean notice, of Jesus dining with sinners, was also in Mk. [Apart from a pair of short inorganic pieces inserted in Mk 2, 15, 16, ἦσαν γὰρ...αὐτῷ and ὅτι ἐσθίει...τελωνῶν, and the citation in Mt. 9, 13a, all absent from

Lk., the text of Mt. and Mk as we have the gospels is almost the same. The only word common to Mk and Lk. and absent from Mt., *κατακείσθαι*, is used by the two (1) in different clauses, (2) in different forms, (3) with different references, and is also a Marcan and a Lucan word, very naturally employed in this context.] If it was in Mk, the notice of the call of "Levi" in Mt. must have given Lk. the impression that the meal was in Levi's house, not (as Mk seems to say) in that of Jesus. In any case the attachment of the whole incident by Mt. to the narrative of the paralytic might have led Lk. to insert it here, in his Marcan paraphrase, Lk. 5, 27-32. If Mk 2, 15-17 was in Lk.'s copy of Mk, it was only the short notice of the call that was transferred, in order to explain the notice that follows.

Mt. 9, 14-17 is also an A-piece.

The whole story of the ruler's daughter, with the episode of the *γυνὴ αἰμορροοῦσα*, Mt. 9, 18-26, is now transcribed. At the beginning of this piece, again, Lk. seems to have found difficulty in the text of Mt., and to have been led by his success in the "Levi" passage into the supposition that here also a proper name was to be supplied. The seven letters in Mt. between *ἄρχων* and *ἐλθών*, namely *ΕΙCΠΡΟC*, had become 'IC I POC. By adding a cross-stroke to the C (suggested, perhaps, as Lk.'s interpretation of I as A may also have been, by chance marks in the papyrus) Lk. obtains the ending -E I POC, and reconstructs IAEI POC. [The *ὄνοματι Ἰάειρος* of Mk is a "western non-interpolation."—Dr Cheyne (*Ency. Bib. ad voc.*) regards this name as "certainly...the spontaneous invention of a pious and poetic imagination." But it is not made out that early Christians were in the habit of inventing appropriate



Hebrew names for the persons that figure in gospel stories. A much more probable origin for such a name is a simple mis-reading, prompted by recollection of a well-known O.T. name. The original of this Jairus seems to be Jair the son of Manasseh.]

At the close of the story Lk. adopts Mt. 9, 26 in the form: *καὶ φήμῃ ἐξῆλθεν καθ' ὅλης τῆς περιχώρου περὶ αὐτοῦ.*

Lk. next accepts, no doubt, the notice of the two blind men, Mt. 9, 27-31, that of the dumb demoniac, Mt. 9, 32, 33, and that of the general preaching, Mt. 9, 35. This is a repetition of Mt. 4, 23, which Lk. has already used at Lk. 4, 32. He now varies the language a little, while retaining the whole substance of Lk. 4, 32, and writes: *καὶ αὐτὸς ἐδίδασκεν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν, δοξαζόμενος ὑπὸ πάντων.* [The *αὐτῶν* refers to the *ὄχλοι* of Mt. 9, 33. The *δοξαζόμενος κ.τ.λ.* corresponds to the *ἐξεπλήσσοντο κ.τ.λ.* of Lk. 4, 32.]

Mt. 9, 36 is rejected, perhaps on internal grounds. It may have seemed strange to Lk. that at a time when Jesus, with great acceptance, is preaching in all the synagogues throughout Galilee, and the crowds are eager to hear him, they should be likened to sheep without a shepherd, and called *ἐσκυλμένοι καὶ ἐριμμένοι.*

But he accepts the next piece, Mt. 9, 37, 38, which likens them to a field ripe for reaping, and calling for more reapers.

Lk. accepts Mt. 10, 1, 5a, the mission to which the piece just mentioned is a prelude, in the form: *συνκαλεσάμενος δὲ τοὺς δώδεκα ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς δύναμιν καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ δαιμόνια καὶ νόσους θεραπεύειν, καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἰᾶσθαι. καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς·*

If Lk. found here in Mt. the names of the Twelve he doubtless transferred them at once to the notice of their appointment (Lk. 6, 13 = Mk 3, 14). In any case the insertion of Lk. 6, 14-17 was evidently made in a passage not intended at first to enclose it, and involves a very long parenthesis, and a very clumsy sentence (*προσεφώνησεν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκλεξάμενος* [46 words] *καὶ καταβὰς μετ' αὐτῶν ἔστη κ.τ.λ.*). But the lists in all three evangelists have important points of difference. If Lk. adopted Mt.'s list at first, it was altered at the revision.

From the charge itself Lk. rejects the opening passage, Mt. 10, 5*b*, 6, and substitutes for it the words of Mt. 10, 16*a*, with which Mt. 10, 6 is certainly inconsistent. If the particularism of Mt. 10, 5*b*, 6 had not been offensive to Lk. himself it could nevertheless have found no place in a writing intended for gentiles. The change of exordium makes both *v.* 7 and *v.* ■ unfit to hold the next place. Lk. continues therefore with Mt. 10, 9, 10*a*; recasts Mt. 10, 10*b*-13, and adds that; finds a place for Mt. 10, 8 and 10, 7; and then, in order, accepts Mt. 10, 14, 15. He has thus used the whole of Mt. 10, 7-16.

The prophetic passages that follow in Mt. evidently have regard to another, a later, state of things than that of Jesus' Galilean ministry, and the mission of the Twelve, even though Mt. 10, 23, 24 seem to assign them to that period, and to promise an early Parusia. Those two verses therefore cannot be used by Lk. Mt. 10, 21, 22 are also rejected, since the idea expressed is in better place at Mt. 10, 35, 36. Lk. also fails to use Mt. 10, 39 (perhaps because the word-play offended his taste) and Mt. 10, 41, 42 (perhaps because the blessing is not pro-

nounced upon kindness, but upon good deeds towards prophets, saints and disciples. Lk.'s own "sentiment," as Renan calls it, is rather that of the Good Samaritan). But all the rest, in the sections into which its internal affinities reduce it, Lk. adds to his *analecta* for future use: namely Mt. 10, 17-20; Mt. 10, 24, 25; Mt. 10, 26-33; Mt. 10, 34-36; Mt. 10, 37, 38.

The slight changes introduced by Lk. into Mt. 10, 7-15 are literary. A little redistribution (Mt. 10, 11*a* and *c* are dispersed; 10, 11*b* drops out) distinguishes the mode of dealing with a house from that of a city. *μὴ κτήσησθε χρυσὸν μηδὲ ἄργυρον μηδὲ χαλκὸν εἰς τὰς ζώνας ὑμῶν* is compressed into *μὴ βαστάζετε βαλλάντιον* (just as, later, Lk. compresses the *μὴ εἰς τὴν ζώνην χαλκὸν* of Mk into *μήτε ἀργύριον*).

At the close of the discourse, and immediately before the embassy of John, Mt. says that *Jesus μετέβη ἐκείθεν* to teach and preach in the cities *αὐτῶν*, which must mean "of the disciples." Perhaps the state of Lk.'s copy of Mt. lead him to read *μετέβησαν*. Possibly he found *μετέβη*, but thought it a mistake. Since Mt. distinctly states that Jesus *ἀπέστειλεν* the Twelve, charging them in the words just ended, it is safe to infer that the disciples, at the close of the charge, went forth to preach. So Lk. writes: *ἐξερχόμενοι δὲ διήρχοντο κατὰ τὰς κώμας εὐαγγελιζόμενοι καὶ θεραπεύοντες πανταχοῦ*.

Next follows (Mt. 11, 2-19) the embassy sent by John, and the reply and occasional discourse. Lk. adopts it all<sup>1</sup>, except Mt. 11, 12-14, and the appended tag

<sup>1</sup> Lk. omits *ἐν τῷ δεσμοῦ τῇ*, Mt. 11, 2, because no explanation of the phrase has yet been reached in Mk or Mt. The little addition at Lk. 3, 19 was motived later by Mk 6, 17 or Mt. 14, 3.

Mt. 11, 15. In Mt. ἡ βασιλεία is something which John as well as Jesus preached (contrast Mt. 3, 2 with Lk. 3, 3): John is Elias, the last of the prophets, and the violence which is being done to the kingdom by ruffians is exemplified by the reception accorded to John and to Jesus. Mt. at 8, 12 applies the phrase υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας to the Jews; Lk. writes simply "you." The kingdom, in fact, to Mt. is Jewish, the natural consummation of the law and the prophets. But to Lk. νόμος and βασιλεία are antithetical terms. Mt. 11, 11 will harmonise with either conception, but Mt. 11, 12-14, as it stands, and in its Matthaean context, will not accord with Lk.'s doctrine of the kingdom. Hence he omits it here, and in the form in which he uses it elsewhere the sense is changed. βιασταί and ἀρπάζουσιν disappear, βιάζεται is used in a new voice, force and construction, and where it stood in Mt. we have the utterly different word εὐαγγελίζεται. The bold metaphor that is so familiar to Christian thought is due to Lk., and cannot be read into Mt. without a disregard of his context.

Mt. 11, 12, with a change, is added to Lk.'s analecta.

Lk. accepts and transcribes Mt. 11, 20-27.

Lk. does not accept Mt. 11, 28-30. Not only does he omit it from this context, where it is hardly in place, but he finds no place for it in his gospel. The meaning cannot have offended him, since he adopts Mt. 23, 4 at Lk. 11, 46b. Probably he disliked this application of the word ζυγός. (Cf. Gal. 5, 1 and Acts 15, 10.) The stress which has been laid on this omission is partly due to the pathetic fallacy. How could Lk. foresee the use that would be made of this text in post-Lutheran days, when δεῦτε πρὸς με became an invitation to accept, by an act

of faith, the redemptive work of Christ, and *πεφορτισμένοι* came to mean "loaded with a sense of guilt"?

Mt. 12, 1-14 is an A-piece. The appended passage Mt. 12, 15-21 consists chiefly (*vv.* 17-21) of a not too apposite citation of Isaiah, which Lk. disregards. There is also a reference to crowds following Jesus, which Lk. need not take over, since he already has several notices of the kind in that part of his gospel. But there is in Mt. 12, 16 a new fact: *καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μὴ φανερὸν αὐτὸν ποιήσωσιν*. As it stands in Mt., where the allusion of *αὐτοῖς* is to many who followed Jesus, and were all healed, it is paradoxical. But Lk. takes it to refer to demoniacs, who (Mk 1, 24; Lk. 4, 34) knew Jesus for what he was. Lk. accordingly adds a short note to his own notice at Lk. 4, 41 (from Mt. 8, 16) *καὶ ἐπιτιμῶν οὐκ εἶα αὐτὰ λαλεῖν, ὅτι ἤδεισαν τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι*<sup>1</sup>. Mt. 12, 11, 12, foreign to Mk, is enrolled among Lk.'s *analecta*.

Coming next, Mt. 12, 22, to the healing of a blind and dumb demoniac, Lk. identifies the incident with that which he has already taken from Mt. 9, 32, 33. He therefore removes what he has already written from its place between the two blind men and the general healing (see above, p. 81) and inserts it here as his preface to the "Beelzebub" section which follows in Mt.: *καὶ ἦν ἐκβάλλων δαιμόνιον κωφόν· ἐγένετο δὲ τοῦ δαιμονίου ἐξελθόντος ἐλάλησεν ὁ κωφός. καὶ ἐθαύμασαν οἱ ὄχλοι*. (The sequence in the earlier passage is now: the Ruler's daughter, *καὶ φήμη ἐξῆλθεν κ.τ.λ.*, the two blind men,

<sup>1</sup> ὁ Χριστός so used appears in Mt. a little earlier (Mt. 11, 2). Apart from the birth-stories this is the first employment of the title in Mt. and in Lk. (since 3, 15 is one of Lk.'s revisionary touches).

καὶ αὐτὸς ἐδίδασκεν...ὑπὸ πάντων, "the labourers are few.")

Looking forward in Mt., Lk. sees that the actual reply of Jesus to the charge of black magic extends to v. 37. It contains the sayings concerning (1) the divided kingdom, Mt. 12, 25, 26; (2) the dilemma, Mt. 12, 27, 28; (3) the strong man, Mt. 12, 29; (4) not with me, against me, Mt. 12, 30; (5) blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, Mt. 12, 31, 32; (6) δένδρον καλὸν καὶ δένδρον σαπρὸν, Mt. 12, 33-35; (7) words the criterion, Mt. 12, 36, 37. Then comes, incidentally, a demand for a sign from heaven, Mt. 12, 38, and Jesus resumes his discourse: he refuses the sign asked for, but speaks of "the sign of Jonah," and of the queen of the south, Mt. 12, 39-42, and then prophecies against the evil γενεά, applying to it a figure of the return of exorcised demons, Mt. 12, 43-45. Immediately follows the incident leading to the saying τίς ἐστὶν ἡ μήτηρ μου; Mt. 12, 46-50. On the same day Jesus went out of the house to the seaside, a crowd followed, and he addressed them from a boat, Mt. 13, 1, 2. The discourse here given is the Sower discourse, which is the limit of Lk.'s work on Mt. alone.

Now according to Mt. all the sayings in Mt. 12, 22-50 belong to one occasion, and indeed one address, and Lk. thinks it would be well to give that address, as far as possible, without a break. It will be necessary, at the end, to mention the occasion of the ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ μου saying, but the rest can be brought together easily, by moving forward to the beginning the notice in Mt. 12, 38, the demand for a heavenly sign: all the more easily because the speech will be shortened by omissions. Lk. does not accept Mt. 12, 36, 37, λόγια which seem to say

"God judges men only by their speech." Mt. 12, 33-35 will also fall out, as a doublet of Mt. 7, 16-18, already used in the Sermon. [Seeking to place every piece most fitly Lk. avoids doublets. All the doublets in Lk. are either (1) short gnomic sayings, such as may be repeated, or (2) pieces accepted from Mt. before Lk. came on their similars in Mk, and of such a kind that neither sequence would tolerate their omission.] Accordingly Lk. employs the converse of his procedure with Mt. 9, 32 sqq. and 12, 22 sqq. He looks back to his transcript of Mt. 7, 16-18 and adds a paraphrase of Mt. 12, 35, 34b (Lk. 6, 45).

The remainder of the discourse passages he arranges in this order: Mt. 12 (22-24, 38), 25-30, 43-45, 39-42. The inversion helps his *καθεξῆς* principle. Jesus' critics charge him with diabolic powers, and demand a celestial sign for his acquittal. Jesus defends himself against the charge, laments that the perversity of this *γενεά* prevents his lastingly cleansing it from unclean spirits, denounces the lust for a sign as itself a token of that perversity, and refuses the sign demanded.

[*ἐνθύμησις* in the N.T. means *Wahn*, what one "weens" (almost "fancy"), and is used with a touch of contempt (Mt. 9, 4; 12, 25; Acts 17, 29; Heb. 4, 12); here it refers to the notion that Jesus was leagued with Beelzebub. Lk.'s *διανοήματα* includes the intention to demand a sign.—For Lk.'s *πίπτει* to represent *οὐ σταθήσεται* in Mt. 12, 25 cf. Rom. 14, 4 *Κυρίῳ στήκει ἢ πίπτει*. There may be a sub-reminiscence of Mt. 7, 27.—*ὅτι* is probably to be read (Lk. 11, 18) in Lk.'s little addition to Mt. 12, 26 (against *τί* in **Σ**), for this verse seems to have been the model of the interpolator of Mk at Mk 3, 30, where the motive is clearly the same that



underlies τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων.—δακτύλῳ for πνεύματι in Mt. 12, 28 is a finely implied reference to Ex. 8, 19: Jesus, working with divine power amid a perverse race, is to the Jews what Moses was to the Egyptians.—The transformation (Lk. 11, 21, 22) of Mt. 12, 29, belongs to Lk.<sub>m</sub>. (καθωπλισμένος, σκῦλον, ἐπεποίθειν *ppf.* do not recur in N.T. διαδιδόναι recurs once in Lk.'s Marcan transcript Lk. 18, 22, once in Acts, once in John. πανοπλία is only used elsewhere in Eph. 6, 11, 13. τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ, with the genitive, is a clear sign of Lk.'s earliest style: cf. Lk. 12, 33, 44: contrast Lk. 8, 3; 12, 15; Acts 4, 32. In Lk. 16, 1 the text is defective in B, but should doubtless read αὐτῷ.) The motive of the change in Lk. (as in the interpolator of Mk) was to avoid the idea of binding a strong man *before* making a way into his house. It seems strange, too, to Lk. that Beelzebub should be called "the strong," and no word be added to indicate that Jesus is still stronger. The metaphor of an ἰσχυρότερος, who disarms the ἰσχυρός and redeems and restores his spoils, meets both difficulties.—Mt. 12, 31, 32 is rather surprisingly placed. The Marcan interpolator was led both to modify and to explain it (Mk 3, 28–30). Lk. enrolls it among his analecta as a remarkable λόγιον, not suited to this context.—Mt. 12, 34a must go with the words to introduce which it has been inserted, Mt. 12, 36, 37.—Of Lk.'s version of Mt. 12, 39, 40 it is usual to say, "it is the more intelligible and intelligent, therefore the more primitive." The contrary view might be urged with equal justification—that is to say, with none, for such facile, summary judgments cannot be justified. The genesis of Lk.'s variations becomes clear when we realise what he is doing.

The explanation in Mt. 12, 40 of the saying in Mt. 12, 39 is (1) inept in this passage, for it makes Jesus promise a sign while in the act of refusing it; (2) offensive in itself, since Lk.'s own account (and every other account) of the Resurrection of Jesus is at variance with it. But Lk. had not far to seek for the true meaning of the *σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ*, which must be no such *σημεῖον* as the *γενεὰ πονηρά* demanded. Mt. 12, 41 gives the clue: the words of Jesus bring their own ratification. Jesus will not give a sign, because he *is* a sign. Lk. makes this clear in ■ most concise and telling sentence (Lk. 11, 30). *Νινευεῖταις* and *τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ* come from Mt. 12, 41.—The position of Lk. 11, 32, the fact that it has already been used by Lk., and its omission by D and (apparently) by the Old Latin version, show that it should be classed with the "Western non-interpolations."]

Mt. does not clearly indicate the scene of the saying "Behold my mother and my brethren." The last clear date of place, Mt. 12, 9, is the interior of a synagogue; but the *τότε* of Mt. 12, 22 may vaguely denote the beginning of a new narrative, not connected with what precedes, and the nature of this passage implies that Jesus was in the open air. Now the *ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ* notice begins: *ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος τοῖς ὄχλοις*, and ends: *ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἐξελθὼν Ἰησοῦς τῆς οἰκίας κ.τ.λ.* Lk. has therefore to choose whether the incident shall be placed in a building or under the sky—in other words whether *ἔξω* Mt. 12, 46 shall mean "out of doors" or "on the fringe of the crowd of listeners." He definitely decides on the latter interpretation, and makes it clear in: *καὶ οὐκ ἠδύναντο συντυχεῖν αὐτῷ διὰ τὸν ὄχλον.* Since the word *ἔξω* must

not be used until its meaning is unambiguous, Lk. transposes the εἰστήκεισαν ἔξω ζητοῦντες αὐτῷ λαλῆσαι of Mt.; it is inserted later by the device of expanding τῷ λέγοντι αὐτῷ into a clause: ἀπηγγέλη δὲ αὐτῷ Ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ἐστήκασιν ἔξω ζητοῦντές σε. The graphic force of Mt. 12, 49, with the gesture and ἰδοῦ, is compressed by Lk. into the single word οὗτοι.

[The first interpolator of Mk also adopted this Lucan setting. But a second interpolator tried to harmonise Mt. and Lk. by writing Mk 3, 19*b*, 20*a* καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς οἶκον καὶ συνέρχεται πάλιν ὄχλος.]

Lk. has now worked through the chapters of Mt., 5 to 12, which seem to stand between the ἀνάβασις εἰς τὸ ὄρος and the parable of the Sower, and most of the matter which he can use at all is already set forth καθεξῆς. *Messi facta spicilegium venire oportet.* He has still to deal with his *analecta*. These are: Mt. 5, 13–15, 18? 25, 26. 32; 6, 9–13. 20–33; 7, 7–14. 22, 23; 8, 11, 12; 10, 17–20; 10, 24–38; 11, 12 (modified); 12, 11, 12. 31, 32.

Divided into sections, according to the sense, they are: Mt. 5, 13*a*. 5, 13*b*. 5, 14*a*. 5, 14*b*. 5, 15. 5, 18. 5, 25, 26. 5, 32. 6, 9–13. 6, 20, 21. 6, 22, 23. 6, 24. 6, 25–33. 7, 7–11. 7, 12. 7, 13, 14 + 7, 22, 23 + 8, 11, 12. 10, 17–20. 10, 24, 25. 10, 26–33. 10, 34–36. 10, 37, 38. 11, 12. 12, 11, 12. 12, 31, 32.

Of these Lk. rejects Mt. 5, 13*a*, 14*a*, as rather violent editorial devices of Mt., to work into his Sermon to disciples the logia Mt. 5, 13*b*, 15. Lk. also fails to use Mt. 5, 14*b*, either because he did not value it, or because he found no fit place for it.

Of the rest, a number are isolated logia, which must if possible be attached severally to suitable contexts, but

will not form a sequence. These are the pieces from Mt. 5 at the beginning, the pieces from Mt. 11 and 12 at the end, and Mt. 6, 24; 7, 12; 10, 24, 25.

There remain, more continuous and tractable passages : Mt. 6, 9-13, 6, 20, 21, 6, 22, 23, 6, 25-33, 7, 7-11, 7, 13, 14, 22, 23, 8, 11, 12, 10, 17-20, 10, 26-33, 10, 34-36, 10, 37, 38.

Surveying this matter Lk. observes :

(1) That Mt. 7, 13, 14, 22, 23; 8, 11, 12, three distinct but consecutive analecta, by a happy accident make good continuous sense as they stand. (Enter the narrow gate, which many seek in vain: yea many shall claim in that day, and be rejected. Then, when they see so many entering, shall be lamentation.)

(2) That Mt. 7, 7-11 makes a good sequel to Mt. 6, 9-13 (both about prayer).

(3) That in the passage, which in Mt. is continuous, Mt. 6, 20-33: Mt. 6, 20, 21 (heavenly treasure) has no obvious connexion with Mt. 6, 22, 23 (the lamp of the body), but forms an excellent sequel to 6, 33 (seek first the kingdom).

(4) That the sequence Mt. 7, 13, 14, 22, 23, 8, 11, 12 which, by transposition of Mt. 7, 7-11, now stands next to Mt. 6, 21, is hardly there in place; but acquires extraordinary force if it is interposed between Mt. 10, 34-36 (I bring not peace, but division) and Mt. 10, 37, 38 (whoso loveth his father or mother more than me).

(5) That Mt. 6, 25-33 + 6, 20, 21 cannot be continued by Mt. 10, 17-20, with which it now stands in contact (when carried before judges, fear not, the Holy Spirit will prompt you) nor by the next section, Mt. 10, 26-33 (encouragements to bold preaching), but that it has some far-off affinity with Mt. 10, 34-36 (no peace on earth); the

beginning of Mt. 6, 25-33 + 6, 20, 21 however, *μὴ μεριμνᾶτε*, can hardly follow Mt. 10, 33 (whosoever shall deny me) but can well succeed Mt. 10, 20 (*μὴ μεριμνήσητε πῶς εἴπητε*), and this passage Mt. 10, 17-20 can just as well follow as precede Mt. 10, 26-33.

(6) That this arrangement, leaving Mt. 6, 22, 23 in contact with Mt. 10, 26-33, will make an excellent joining (let your whole body be full of light: no hidden thing but shall be revealed).

Lk. therefore redistributes his matter on this plan; that is to say, he brings forward Mt. 7, 7-11 to follow Mt. 6, 9-13; transposing Mt. 10, 17, 20 and 10, 26-33 he transfers to a place after them Mt. 6, 25-33 and 6, 20, 21; and the sequence Mt. 7, 13, 14, 22, 23, 8, 11, 12 is inserted between Mt. 10, 36 and 10, 37.

This forms, however, not one sequence, but two. There is no internal link between Mt. 7, 11 and Mt. 6, 22. But if the prayer-sequence Mt. 6, 9-13, 7, 7-11 be for the moment disregarded, the second sequence will fall admirably into place as a continuation of the last speech of Jesus in the completed part of Lk.<sub>m</sub>—the sign of Jonah, "a greater than Solomon is here." The course of thought "I give no sign because I am a sign; let your eye be single, and ye shall see" could not be bettered. When this attachment is made it is natural to seek a place somewhat earlier for the prayer-sequence. Lk. finds a very happy nexus after Mt. 11, 27. Jesus addresses his Father, *ἐξομολογοῦμαί σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς...ναί, ὁ πατήρ, ὅτι οὕτως εὐδοκία ἐγένετο ἔμπροσθέν σου*. Then in words which seem to be at once words of praise, of reflection and of exposition he speaks of the relation of the Son to the Father, and of

the revelation of the Father through the Son. Where else should the next words be set—"when ye pray, say 'Father' "?

So that the earlier sequence is inserted just before, and the later sequence just after (in continuation of) the section beginning with the healing of the dumb demoniac, and the charge of black magic.

(The sequence of Matthaean matter from Mt. 11, 25 onwards is as follows: Mt. 11, 25-27, 6, 9-13, 7, 7-11; 12, 22-24, 38, 25-30, 43-45, 39-42, 6, 22, 23, 10, 26-33, 10, 17-20, 6, 25-33, 20, 21, 10, 34-36, 7, 13, 14, 22, 23, 8, 11, 12, 10, 37, 38. These pieces still maintain their order in canonical Lk., though the sequence has been dislocated by the insertion of two whole Matthaean sequences, Lk. 11, 39-52 and 12, 39-46, many small Matthaean pieces and many pieces of Lk.'s peculiar matter. Some of this expansion happened already in the progress of Lk.<sub>m</sub>; the rest at the revision.)

Having arranged the longer passages Lk. next seeks to find a niche in their sequence for his shorter analecta, to wit Mt. 5, 13; 5, 15; 5, 18; 5, 25, 26; 5, 32; 11, 12; 12, 11, 12; 12, 31, 32 and also for three fragments detached in the recent process of articulation, 6, 24; 7, 12 and 10, 24, 25*a*. In this attempt he is admirably successful. All the eleven pieces except three are either digested into the sequence or appended to it; for two of the three he finds places in the Sermon.

Mt. 5, 15 is placed at the beginning of the consecutive piece last constructed, that is before Mt. 6, 22 and after Mt. 12, 42. The suggestion for this attachment lay in the word *λύχνος*, and the repetition of this word, with the asyndeton, gives to Lk. 11, 31-34 a beautiful effect

of indignant rhetoric. (Jesus is himself the *λύχνος* of Mt. 5, 15; Lk. 11, 33, as he is the sign, and the *πλεῖον Σολομῶνος*. The verse is a defence of his public ministry of word and deed. But the next verse replies to the unspoken repudiation of him by the Pharisees. "No light to you? Nay, what light can any lamp give to the eye that sees not?")

The terrible text Mt. 12, 31, 32, compressed into a briefer form, is placed between Mt. 10, 33 and Mt. 10, 18 (at Lk. 12, 10)—that is, between a verse which speaks of denying the Son of Man, and one that speaks of the work of the Holy Spirit.

Mt. 5, 25, 26 (agree with thine adversary) is most ingeniously set between Mt. 10, 34–36 (not peace but division) and Mt. 7, 13 (strive to enter through the narrow gate). Subsequent insertions have obscured the motive for this placing (Lk. 12, 58, 59).

Mt. 5, 13; 6, 24; 11, 12; 5, 18 and 5, 32 are all added together, in this order, at the end of the sequence; so that the chain of meaning runs: He that followeth me not cannot be my disciple; what is salt without its savour? None can serve two masters. The law and the prophets till John: thence onward the kingdom of God. But no whit of the law can fail. He that divorceth and marrieth is an adulterer.—If any links in this chain seem especially weak they are those which unite the last piece with the last but one, and the last but one with its predecessor. It so happens, however, that these three verses still stand in juxtaposition in canonical Lk. (16, 16–18).—The original attachment of Mt. 6, 24 and Mt. 11, 12 is very interesting: the two masters were the law and the kingdom, or Moses and Jesus. Evidently Lk. omitted the additional clause



οὐ δύνασθε θεῶ δουλεύειν καὶ μαμωνᾶ, but did not feel quite easy in mind about its rejection, and brought it in again at the revision when he inserted Lk. 16, 1-8; or perhaps when he inserted (in Lk.<sub>m</sub>?) the reminiscence of Mt. 25, 21 which stands as Lk. 16, 10-12.

[Mt. 12, 11, 12 also stands in canonical Lk. 14, 5, carefully paraphrased, in the body of this sequence: but only by accident. It has no connexion with the preceding or succeeding verse of the now dislocated sequence, but forms part of a peculiar notice, modelled on Mk 3, 1 sqq.; Mt. 12, 9 sqq., inserted at the revision.]

Mt. 7, 12 was placed in the Sermon between Mt. 5, 42 and Mt. 5, 46 (at Lk. 6, 31), where it is spiritually in place, but certainly disturbs the close connexion between Lk. 6, 30 and 6, 32.

Mt. 10, 24, 25a is also rather hard to connect either with the verse that follows, Mt. 7, 3, in whose stead it took the first place in a section, or with the verse Mt. 15, 14b which was subsequently put in front of it. The inherent idea in all three verses which justifies their collocation is the rebuke of spiritual arrogance or presumption.

Lk. has now disposed all his analecta in the long piece of ordered writing which paraphrases all that he adopts from Mt. 5-12. But in so doing he has displaced one notice, Mt. 12, 46-50, "my mother and my brethren." In order to get a better sequence he had removed Mt. 12, 38 to the beginning, and this notice to the end, of the Beelzebub and sign discourse. But now, by joining Mt. 5, 15; 6, 22, 23 to Mt. 12, 42, he has extended the discourse, to the exclusion of the notice. A new place

must be found for it. Lk. seems to have been in some little perplexity about this notice. Mt. unambiguously dates it on the day of the Beelzebub discourse, and it must be given as an episode in an open-air address, so that the suitable places for it are few. On the one hand it is open to Lk. to place it exactly as in Mt., that is after Mt. 12, 45; Lk. 11, 26; but this will derange the plan on which Lk. acted in moving forward Mt. 12, 38, that of uniting the Beelzebub discourse with the sign of Jonah discourse. On the other hand a break can be made after the first few verses added to the discourse, Mt. 5, 13; 6, 22, 23; this also will disturb a sequence, but not destructively. In either case a new introduction will have to be added to the matter immediately following: the most natural will be a brief allusion to the thronging crowd.

Lk. seems actually to have inserted the notice in *both* places. Being compelled to do so in one or other of them, and disliking the dislocation which it caused in each, he probably wrote it experimentally in the two, and deferred his decision of the question which should be struck out. He made use in each of the Matthaean introductory data (ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος Mt. 12, 46, ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ λέγειν αὐτὸν ταῦτα Lk. 11, 27, ἐν δὲ τῷ λαλῆσαι Lk. 11, 37) and makes the same kind of transition to discourse at the end of the notice (τῶν δὲ ὄχλων ἐπαθροισζομένων ἤρξατο λέγειν Lk. 11, 29, ἐν οἷς ἐπισυναχθεῖσὼν τῶν μυριάδων τοῦ ὄχλου...ἤρξατο λέγειν Lk. 12, 1). The second member of each of these pairs has probably been varied at the revision. [The only other examples of ἐν τῷ λέγειν αὐτὸν or the like in Lk. are at Lk. 8, 49, parallel to Mk, and 22, 47 parallel to Mk and Mt. At Lk. 22, 60 ἔτι λαλοῦντος

*αὐτοῦ* is not read in the Syriac, and was probably absent from Lk.<sub>m</sub>; in any case it is merely an emphasising of the *παραχρῆμα* which represents the *εὐθύς* of Mk and Mt. At 13, 17 and 24, 36, peculiar matter, the phrases are not comparable with this.—The nearest parallel to the two transition pieces is Lk. 5, 1, *ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ τὸν ὄχλου ἐπικεῖσθαι αὐτῷ*, which was written, as will appear, almost immediately afterwards.]

All that Lk. now has to do before proceeding with his work on Mk and Mt. conjointly is to make attachments at the beginning and at the end of his long transcript from Mt. Both of these occasion some difficulty. Lk.'s original plan of dating what he took from Mt. on the mountain top, and the Sower discourse a little lower on the hill side, on a plateau (see pp. 62, 63) has become impossible, for the Matthaean matter has extended far beyond the Sermon, and the scene has changed several times. The crowd at Mk 4, 1 can no longer be associated with the Sermon in any way. But a crowd had been mentioned by Mt. 4, 25 before the Sermon, and Mt.'s wording was really the basis of Lk.'s language in the intended introduction to the Sower discourse. A few strokes of the pen transform that introduction accordingly, and attach it, as a whole, to the Sermon. Lk. strikes out *λέγων*, changes *ἀπὸ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ* to *ἀπ' αὐτῶν*, strikes out *συνάγεται πρὸς αὐτόν*, makes the converse substitution of *εἰς τοὺς μαθητάς* for *εἰς αὐτούς*, and all is effected. Except for a few later revisionary touches, and the list of apostles, Lk. 6, 12–20 stands as we now read it.

At the other end of the Matthaean paraphrase, where

it is to be attached to the Sower passage, there is a difficulty arising out of the discrepancy of date in Mk and Mt. Mk places the discourse on "the mountain." Mt. says that it was spoken from a boat near the sea-shore. The one point in which they are agreed is the presence of a large crowd. This, then, is all that Lk. can adopt. He writes: *συνιόντος* [or *συνελθόντος* D] *δὲ ὄχλου πολλοῦ*, and, with a wistful reminiscence of his lost introduction, *καὶ τῶν κατὰ πόλιν ἐπιπορευομένων πρὸς αὐτόν*, and proceeds to the parable.

What then is he to do with the picturesque detail given by Mt.? Lk. assumes that it is historical, but wrongly placed. Casting about for the true position of this piece, he remembers the Call of Simon, also recorded by Mt. Surely Simon and the others must have heard Jesus, before they obeyed that abrupt *δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου*! Jesus preached from the very boat of the man who was to become his chief disciple. The idea captivates him. Under the influence of recent writing, Lk. 11, 29 and Lk. 12, 1, he pens the phrase *ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ τὸν ὄχλου ἐπικεῖσθαι αὐτῷ*, and adds that Jesus stood by the Lake, and entered one of the boats, and preached. (The wording of the whole notice was no doubt retouched at the revision, when the miracle was added.)

[Many points of interest appear in the form which Lk. gives to his Matthaean matter. A few of these must here suffice. It should always be remembered that Lk. used his pen very freely at the revision, so that we cannot always ascertain the original state of this matter in Lk.<sub>m</sub>.

It is often argued that Matthaean passages omitted

by Lk. must have been unknown to him. (This argument is used even by critics who hold that the "Great Omission" in Mk lay before Lk.) It may therefore be well to point out that Mt. 6, 5-8 was certainly known to Lk., though it does not find a place in his text. (Mt. 6, 7, 8 however is read by D, probably from Lk.<sub>m</sub>.) The *ὅταν προσεύχησθε λέγετε* of Lk. 11, 2 is a combination of *ὅταν προσεύχησθε* Mt. 6, 3 and *οὕτως οὖν προσεύχεσθε ὑμεῖς* Mt. 6, 9, a deferred apodosis which presupposes Mt. 6, 5-8.

The omissions which Lk., primarily or ultimately, made from Mt.'s version of the Paternoster are of a routine character, and give no countenance to the theory that Lk.'s version, because it is shorter, must be the more primitive. Lk. never uses phrases which (1) seem to represent the sky as God's dwelling-place (see above, pp. 68-70; Lk.'s simple *πάτερ* holds a relation which we have observed to the *πάτερ* of Lk. 10, 21, the *ὁ πατήρ* of Lk. 10, 21, 22, which in Lk.<sub>m</sub> almost immediately preceded the Paternoster); (2) take *θέλημα θεοῦ* as the divine desire for righteousness (see above, pp. 71, 72); (3) or allude to *ὁ πονηρός*. (Lk.'s earlier word is *ὁ διάβολος*—five times in the Temptation, once in the Interpretation of the Sower; in one Marco-Matthaeian passage (Mt. 12, 26, Marcan interpolator 3, 26; Lk. 11, 18) he accepts from Mt. *Σατανᾶς*, which is also his word in the peculiar matter. It is easy to understand that Lk. shrank from writing *ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου*.)

The alterations which Lk. made are of a quasi-exegetical kind: *τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν* for *σήμερον* (which is precisely the same in intention as the A.V. "daily" for *ἐπιούσιον*), *τὰς ἀμαρτίας* for *ὀφειλήματα* (to exclude the idea of remission of duties), and the assertion *καὶ γὰρ*

αὐτοὶ ἀφίομεν παντὶ ὀφείλονται ἡμῖν for a less clear but equivalent phrase.

The last part of Lk.'s version of Mt. 6, 22, 23, as we have it at Lk. 11, 35, 36, is clearly corrupt. The corruption probably goes back as far as Lk. 11, 35, for σκόπει οὖν μή with ἐστὶν is very suspicious. In 11, 36 ὅλον ὡς for *omnino ut* is unexampled, and the sense is at once turbid and vapid. Two things seem to appear: (1) the text has not been reached by mere error, but contains a scribe's conjecture; (2) the scribe must have had a half-obliterated text before him, and in that text he must have read ἀστραπή.

I suggest that Lk., at the revision, seeking to find a place for the logion now at Lk. 10, 18, was first attracted to this context, which speaks of a contrast of darkness and light. The ἐξουσία τοῦ σκότους (Lk. 22, 53, cf. 22, 3) is Satan (cf. Acts 26, 18 τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι ἀπὸ σκότους εἰς φῶς καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ Σατανᾶ ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν). An obliterated verse already stood in the place immediately after Lk.'s version of Mt. 6, 23, namely a transition which he had made, while experimentally working on this Matthaean sequence, from τὸ σῶμά σου σκοτεινόν to μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν...μηδὲ τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν. It may well have run: εἰ οὖν τὸ σῶμά σου ὅλον φωτεινόν, μὴ ἔχον μέρος τι σκοτεινόν, ἐστὶν φωτεινὴ καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ σου. Between the lines of this erased verse Lk. wrote, it is suggested, the logion: ἐθεώρουν τὸν Σατανὰν ὡς ἀστραπὴν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πεσόντα—and then, finding a better place for it, erased this also. Some scribe who copied Lk.'s own manuscript (the original ms. of Lk.<sub>m</sub>, used again by Lk. in his revision) took the obliteration to be the result of accident, and tried to read it all as a

connected piece. Under his care the -ΕCΤ-ΦΩΤΕΙΝ- becomes ἔσται φωτεινόν, the -Ο-Ν- of ἐθεώρουν becomes ὅλον, the -C-TAN- of Σατανάν makes ὡς ὅταν (ὅταν occurs above), a misreading of the remnants of ΨΥΧΗCOY suggests λύχνος (which occurs twice, and λυχνίαν once, above), and these with ἀστραπή make out: ἔσται φωτεινόν ὅλον ὡς ὅταν [ό] λύχνος [τη] ἀστραπή—. How could he fail to conjecture for a close φωτίζη σε? In some such way, with the aid of the "fall as lightning" logion, the corruption may be explained.

As for σκόπει οὖν μή, that looks like a misreading of the εἰ οὖν which precedes the τὸ φῶς ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἐστίν in Mt., and presumptively at first in Lk. It may be that this piece (= Mt. 6, 23, c) was itself obliterated to make room for the (subsequently unnecessary<sup>1</sup>) εἰ οὖν τὸ σῶμα link.

Professor Schmiedel ingeniously suggests that πνεῦμα ἅγιον in Lk.'s version of Mt. 7, 10 (at Lk. 11, 13) is a corruption of παν αγαθον through πνᾶ αγαθον to πνᾶ αγιον. But (1) Lk. never does so use πᾶν distributive with a neuter adjective (Schmiedel's reference to James 1, 17 is good for matter only, not for construction) and (2) Lk. refers to the πνεῦμα ἅγιον more than any other evangelist. It is intelligible that he should in this passage avoid making Jesus seem to regard temporal welfare as a sign of a son of God.

In Lk.'s version of Mt. 10, 27 (Lk. 12, 3) we seem to see a trace of the poor state of his ms. of Mt. The words ἐν τη σκοτίᾳ εἶπατε ἐν τῷ φωτί correspond literatim in both gospels. If Lk. could not read the preceding ὁ λέγων ὑμῖν of Mt. he would naturally take εἶπατε as aorist indicative, and shape his sentence accordingly. At his

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 90—93.



revision, if not earlier, he might bring the parallel saying that follows into congruity with this. (*ἀνθ' ὧν* seems to be later Lucan. It means 'inasmuch as,' *not* 'wherefore,' which is a mistake in our English version. The sense is, 'Every secret thing shall be revealed: since even what you whisper in the darkness in inner chambers shall be proclaimed and heard on the house-top.')

Two little changes in numbers, in Lk.'s versions of Mt. 10, 29 and 35 (Lk. 12, 6 and 52, 53), have also led to ingenious conjectures. But a simple explanation applies to each. In Mt. 10, 29 *καὶ ἐν αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ.* is, when applied to two objects only, a slightly ludicrous form of speech. Lk.'s *πέντε* (followed by *ἄσσανίων δύο*, for what else could he have written?) avoids that defect. His substitute for *οὐ πσεῖται...ἄνευ* is also an improvement. The *τρῆς* and the *δύο* introduced by Lk. into Mt. 10, 35 are, on the one hand, the elders, *πατὴρ καὶ μήτηρ καὶ πενθερά*, and on the other hand the juniors, *υἱὸς καὶ θυγάτηρ*, who is also *νύμφη*. (One might almost suppose that Lk. had some particular family in mind, where a young Christian married couple lived with the wife's mother and both parents of the husband. The continuation of Micah's prophecy is dropped, since its wording is too strong for the case thought of, and for a similar reason *μάχαιραν* is softened to *διαμερισμόν*.)]

#### § 4. **Work on Mark and Matthew.**

When Lk., after completing and attaching his Matthaean sequence, began to work once more on Mk and Mt. together (Mk 4, Mt. 13) he very soon discovered a fact which led to important changes in his gospel. On reaching Mk 4, 25, which is the end of the first section (a parable,

the disciples' question about its meaning, and Jesus' reply, ending in a few gnomic utterances) Lk. finds that Mk's next section (Mk 4, 35 sqq.) has already been paraphrased by him in his Matthaean sequence. This is the first of three pieces which may conveniently be called B-pieces—those which Lk. found in Mt., and transcribed from Mt., before he found them in Mk: to wit, Mk 4, 35–5, 17; Mk 5, 22–43 (these two are practically continuous in Mk, being cemented by a continuation of the first piece, Mk 5, 18–20); and Mk 6, 7–11<sup>1</sup>. The consequences of Lk.'s recognition of these pieces are as follows:

(1) Since Mk's narrative is the chronological backbone of Lk.'s compilation, these B-pieces must be detached from the Matthaean sequence, and inserted in their Marcan contexts.

(2) So far as possible all narrative notices that are dated either by Mk or Mt. *before* these notices must stand before them also in Lk., and

(3) Notices dated by either evangelist *after* these notices must stand after them in Lk.

The first results of Lk.'s application of these three principles of working were as follows:

(1) Lk. detached these passages from his Matthaean sequence<sup>1</sup>, but not quite cleanly. Some fringe of Matthaean matter clung to each. At the end of the first piece, after *καὶ ἠρώτησεν αὐτὸν...ἀπελθεῖν ἀπ' αὐτῶν, φόβῳ γὰρ μεγάλῳ συνείχοντο* = Mt. 8, 34 b *καὶ...αὐτὸν παρεκάλεσαν ὅπως μεταβῇ ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρίων αὐτῶν* Lk. carried over also *αὐτὸς δὲ ἐμβὰς εἰς πλοῖον ὑπέστρεψεν* (or an earlier form of this phrase) = Mt. 9, 1 a (the other half of this verse in Mt. has already been attached to the

<sup>1</sup> See however below, pp. 107, 110.

A-piece Mt. 9, 1 *b* sqq.; Mk 2, 3 sqq. See above, pp. 78, 79) *καὶ ἐμβὰς εἰς πλοῖον διεπέρασεν.*

[This opens an interesting question. Is it not a very striking coincidence that canonical Mk 5, 18 should read *καὶ ἐμβαίνοντος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον*? If this stood in original Mk, and was the source of Mt.'s verse 9, 1 *a*, how came Mt. to omit the notice Mk 5, 18–20, and to attach his verse to quite another notice, the healing of a paralytic? The coincidence and the omission, taken together, speak for the absence of this passage from original Mk. How then did it creep in? Clearly from Lk. 8, 37–39. But how, in that case, did this notice get into Lk.? Lk. cannot have invented it while compiling Lk.<sub>m</sub>. He must have had some real or fancied source for it, and it must have been added at the revision. For this speaks also the fact that Lk. 8, 40 sounds like an immediate continuation of Lk. 8, 37 *b*: *αὐτὸς δὲ ἐμβὰς εἰς πλοῖον ὑπέστρεψεν· ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ ὑποστρέφαι... ἀποδέξασθαι αὐτὸν τὸν ὄχλον.* (This was inserted to prepare for the crowd which appears in Mk's narrative, but not in Mt.'s, of the *γυνὴ αἰμορροοῦσα*, and has led to a secondary insertion in Mk.) Can we point to any possible origin for this Lucan passage?—I suggest that it arose, at the revision, from a partial deciphering by Lk. of an obliterated passage which followed in his own manuscript, namely the A-piece that follows in Mt. Lk. seems to have copied this out without identifying it, at first, with the much shorter notice Mk 2, 3 sqq. When he realised its character he chose to enlarge his Marcan notice, rather than to cut out and sew in what he had written in the Matthaean transcript. This last he obliterated, somewhat imperfectly, and naturally continued his transcript on the clean papyrus beyond

the obliteration. When Lk. transferred his B-pieces he had no earlier version written, so he found it simpler to cut them out and sew them in than to rewrite them. (The sewing could be done by a servant!) This piece was cut off at the end of the obliterated piece, before the beginning of the next notice. (Lk. was acting as any other person would naturally have acted.) But since the whole piece was also sewn in just as it was, through mischance or carelessness or laziness, or for convenience of handling a bigger piece of papyrus<sup>1</sup>, when it met Lk.'s eye again at the revision he did not recollect the nature of this partially legible passage, but took it for a passage adopted by himself, and *accidentally* defaced. Now that passage was Lk. 5, 18-25, which contains *πορεύου εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου*, a phrase that occurs (D reads *πορεύου*, B *ὑπόστρεφε*) at Lk. 8, 39 and (on either reading) nowhere else in Lk. This is followed by an *ἀπῆλθεν* as in Lk. 8, 39 *b*, and *δοξάζων τὸν θεόν*, for which cf. that verse again. The faint remainder of *παραλελυμένος* may have suggested *ἐξεληλύθει* (-Λ-ΛΥ-); *εἶναι σὺν αὐτῷ* may be the ghost of *θεῖναι αὐτόν*: *ἀπέλυσεν* [δὲ] *αὐτὸν λέγων* could be the result of a misreading of *παραλελυμένῳ σοὶ λέγω* (A-ΕΛΥ-ΕΝ).—It is to be observed that *διηγοῦ ὅσα σοι ἐποίησεν* seems reminiscent of Lk. 9, 10 *διηγῆσαντο αὐτῷ ὅσα ἐποίησαν* (*διηγεῖσθαι* occurs nowhere else in Lk.); that *κατά* with the accusative of place, *not* distributive, only recurs in peculiar matter (Lk. 10, 4 *b*, 32, 33; 15, 14); that *ἀφ' οὗ ἐξεληθύθει τὰ δαιμόνια* is reminiscent of the peculiar notice Lk. 8, 2 *ἀφ' ἧς δαιμόνια ἐπτὰ ἐξεληλύθει*; and that in Mk *ἐμβαίνειν* recurs four times in non-Lucan pieces only; that *δαιμονισθεῖς* is unique in this gospel, and seems

<sup>1</sup> Or to preserve the necessary breadth.

to come from the preceding verse in Lk. (*not* Mk); that this *δαιμονισθείς* (Lk. 8, 36) is Lk.'s only employment of the verb *δαιμονίζεσθαι*, and belongs apparently to the revision, since the "Western" MSS. read *Λεγιών*; and that *πρὸς τοὺς σοὺς* introduces an idiom foreign to Mk, though not unknown in Lk. (cf. 6, 30; 15, 31; 16, 12, and not quite comparable 15, 31; 22, 42).]

The second B-piece (Mt. 9, 18–25 = Mk 5, 22–43) carried with it to its place in Lk.'s Marcan parallel a much larger amount of Matthaean matter. The comment at the close, *καὶ φήμη ἐξῆλθεν καθ' ὅλης τῆς περιχώρου περὶ αὐτοῦ*, naturally went with the notice. And it is also necessary to take with it two notices which Mt. dates by it, the healing of two blind men who followed Jesus *παράγοντι ἐκεῖθεν*, and (after the now omitted miracle Mt. 9, 32, 33, see above, p. 81), the general preaching in synagogues, *καὶ αὐτὸς ἐδίδασκεν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν, δοξαζόμενος ὑπὸ πάντων*. (By anticipation it may be said that when Lk. reached the passage Mk 10, 46 sqq.; Mt. 22, 29 sqq. he identified Mt. 9, 27–31 with the miracle there recorded, and, rejecting Mt.'s dualism, struck this passage out, and followed Mk in the Marcan context. Cf. in the earlier and the later Matthaean notice: *ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ* with *ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ*, *δύο τυφλοί* in both, *λέγοντες* and *ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς υἱὸς Δαυεὶδ* in both, *ἤψατο τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν* in both, *ἠνεώχθησαν αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί* with *ἵνα ἀνοιγῶσιν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν*.—The phrase *κατὰ τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν γεννηθήτω ὑμῖν* is however not repeated in the later Matthaean passage, though an equivalent saying is recorded in Mk and accepted by Lk. It was perhaps the belief that Jesus had once uttered a blessing in this form, though Mt. had mistaken the occasion, that led Lk.

to insert ὡς ἐπίστευσας γεννηθήτω σοι in the Centurion notice in Lk.<sub>m</sub>. See above, p. 76.—In consequence of the removal of this notice the Matthaean piece which stood after the Ruler's daughter in Lk. was reduced to καὶ φήμη ἐξήλθεν καθ' ὅλης τῆς περιχώρου περὶ αὐτοῦ· καὶ αὐτὸς ἐδίδασκεν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν, δοξαζόμενος ὑπὸ πάντων.)

The third B-piece, Mt. 10, 5-14 = Mk 6, 7-11<sup>1</sup>, seems to have taken with it Mt. 11, 1, the conclusion to *Mt.*'s missionary charge: but Lk. either found it half-erased, or adapted it, so that in Lk. 9, 6 it refers also to the disciples, not to Jesus alone.

(2) The narratives dated by *Mt.* or *Mk.* *before* the B-pieces Mk 4, 35; 5, 43 are already, by the omission of the A-pieces from Lk.'s Matthaean transcript, in proper place. But one notice will nevertheless require to be considered under this rule, as will shortly appear.

(3) Notices dated after these narratives must not come in before them. This affects every narrative in the Matthaean sequence after the Centurion, and every discourse after the Sermon. Even Mt. 8, 19-22, attached by *Mt.* to the first B-piece, must, since *Mk.* does not recognise it there, and has not yet recorded it, be regarded as a later event. Thus the Matthaean sequence is inevitably cut in two after Mt. 8, 13. All the rest must be detached, and held in waiting for a fit point of insertion in *Mk.*

This involves however among other things the indefinite postponement of Mt. 12, 46-50, "my mother and my brethren," which *Mt.* definitely dates on the same day as the Sower discourse. A way must be found to avoid such a mishap. It is impossible to insert it before the Sower, after the Centurion, since the proper setting cannot

<sup>1</sup> See below, p. 110.

there be found or made; nor can it be put after the long connected narrative that begins at Mk 4, 35, since the evening of the day has already been reached when it begins; so that the only possible place, which is at the same time an appropriate place, is between the Sower and the Storm. Lk. therefore strikes out that passage where he has written it after Mt. 6, 22, 23, and inserts it after his parallel to Mk 4, 25. He is the more encouraged to do this in that the *λύχνος* verse from Mt. 5, 15, which had almost immediately preceded it in its last position, and also the verse from Mt. 10, 26, *οὐδὲν δὲ συγκεκαλυμμένον*, which had immediately followed it, are both included just above in the Marcan conclusion to the Sower discourse. (It is not said in Lk. or Mt., and almost certainly not in original Mk, that Jesus was alone with his disciples during the second part of the discourse: so that the *συνιόντος ὄχλου πολλοῦ* of Lk. 8, 4 still holds good for Lk. 8, 19.) Still, Lk. does not feel justified in transferring his introductory *ἐν δὲ τῷ λαλῆσαι* from what is now Lk. 11, 37, and applying it to an utterance to which it did not, in his original, refer. Nor is the end-link (now Lk. 12, 1) necessary or suitable to the new situation of the notice. Both were left therefore in their original places, which they still hold.

Now it would seem that in striking out the notice at one place, and inserting it at another, Lk. forgot that he had left it provisionally in two places. Or else Lk. was still in two minds about it: should he give it in a place determined by Mt.'s *date*, or following the significant *utterance* to which Mt. had attached it, "the first shall be last"? In any case he seems still to have let it stand in two places. Only at the revision did he displace one of



these by the milder rebuke of Lk. 11, 27, 28. (*μενοῦν* is decisive. It is distinctively later Lucan. In the gospel it only occurs at the peculiar insertion 3, 18 and here. In Acts it is frequent.)

The only other important transposition may also be anticipated here. The place which Lk. chooses for the attachment of the rest of his Matthaean sequence is his parallel to Mk 10, 1 (immediately after Mk 9, 40), Mt. 19, 1. Up to that point there is no opportune occasion for it. Mk is connected and continuous. Here however a journey to Jerusalem gives a setting not unlike the vague *περιῆγεν διδάσκων καὶ θεραπεύων*, which is the setting of the Matthaean matter in Mt. 5-12. When Jerusalem has once been reached many of the notices will be excluded. Hence Lk. is led to make at this point his second Great Insertion. But already at Mk 6, 16; Mt. 14, 2 Lk. has read that John was dead. Therefore the notice from Mt. 11, 2-11, 16-19 that refers to John as still alive must be removed to an earlier context. It cannot well be introduced into the Marcan narrative, nor is there a place for it within the earlier part of the Matthaean sequence, which consists only of the Sermon and the Centurion. It must be placed, then, between the Matthaean transcript and the resumed Marco-Matthaean parallel—after Mt. 8, 5-10, 13 and before Mk 4, Mt. 13. To that place, after the Centurion, it is accordingly removed.

The removal leaves in place: Mt. 10, 15, 40; 11, 20-27. Now 11, 20 has a strange effect when it follows the missionary charge without a break. It had better be omitted. 10, 15 is identical with 11, 24, now only a few verses away. It is better to combine the two, since 11, 21-23 can as well follow 11, 24 as precede it. Lk. therefore rearranges this

part of his Matthaean sequence: Mt. 10, 15 (11, 24); 11, 21-23; 10, 40; 11, 25-27. In this order it still stands (Lk. 10, 12-16, 21, 22. Lk. 10, 17-20 came in at the revision.)

In his progress through the Marco-Matthaean parallel, Lk. takes note of Mt. 13, 16, 17 as non-Marcian: and at once finds a place for it at the end of his main Matthaean sequence, before the interruption of Matthaean order made by the insertion of the prayer-passages; that is to say, after Mt. 11, 27, where Mt. 13, 16, 17 is admirably in place, but somewhat obscures the connexion between Mt. 11, 25-27 and Mt. 6, 9 sqq. The citation of Isaiah, Mt. 13, 14, 15, impressed itself upon his mind, for he uses it with dramatic effect at the close of Acts. Mt. 13, 31-33 also found a home in the second Great Insertion, in the deferred part of the Matthaean transcript, Sequence (ε), for that became a receptacle for most of Lk.'s analecta from Mt. in his subsequent work, and also for much of his peculiar matter.

Lk.'s transcript of the Nazareth notice, Mk 6, 1; Mt. 13, 53 and onwards, may be presumed in Lk.<sub>m</sub>, where it occupied its Marcan position, to have also preserved a form much more like that of Lk.'s sources than that which it has in canonical Lk.

Strictly speaking Mk 6, 7-11 is not a true B-piece, since it is only the transcript of Mt. 10, 1, 5*a* that is transferred through identification with Mk 6, 7, whereas Mt. 10, 5*b*-8 have been rejected, and Mt. 10, 9-11 keep their place in the Matthaean sequence, while a new parallel is found for Mk 6, 8-11. But the transference of Mt. 10, 1, 5*a* to the beginning, and of Mt. 11, 1 to the

end of this short discourse, serves to show that Lk. really identified this mission with that recorded in Mt. 10; and since this becomes the first mission, Lk. was constrained to alter his preface to the Matthaean missionary discourse, now standing so much later in his gospel, in a sense which revealed it as a second mission. The actual wording of Lk. 10, 1 as we now have it must date only from the revision, when Lk. ventured upon much bolder deviations from the Marco-Matthaean representation than he used in Lk.<sub>m</sub>.

A remarkable feature in the text of Lk. 9, 10 makes it clear that in Lk. 9, 10, 11 he was relying on Mt. alone, and that here also the copy of Mt. which he used was damaged. The words *ἐρημον τόπον κατ' ἰδίαν* must have stood at the foot of a column, so that the lower part of the letters had disappeared, and the *ε* of *ἐρημον* was also illegible. Thus

ΕΡΗΜΟΝΤΟΠΟΝΚΑΤΙΔΙΑΝ

becoming ΡΗΤΟΜΤΟΠΟΝΚΑΤΙΔΙΑΝ

was read as ΒΗ CAI ΠΟΛΙΚΑΛ Μ leading to the conjecture ΒΗΘCAIΔΑΠΟΛΙΝΚΑΛΟΥΜΕΝΗΝ

which Lk. inverts into πόλιν καλουμένην Βηθσαιδά.

(The upper part of a P is easily misread as B, that of N as M or A, and that of O as C. When once ΒΗ-CAI ΠΟΛΙ had been reached Βηθσαιδά πόλιν was an easy conjecture.)

## CHAPTER IV

### THE INSERTION OF LUKE'S PECULIAR MATTER AT THE REVISION<sup>1</sup>

We have now followed Lk. in his work on Mk and Mt. up to the Great Omission.

At the Revision everything that is not yet accounted for in Canonical Luke came in. The result, in the Matthaean sequences, was a dislocation of context in many places, but very little disturbance of order.

In the Marcan matter so far considered the chief change was the removal of the Nazareth notice from its Marcan context. The cause of this change lay perhaps in Lk.'s desire to begin the Galilean ministry of Jesus, in the city after which he was named, with an experience that showed in little the fate that was to befall him in his career at large. The excuse or occasion for the transference of the notice was furnished by the words of Mt. 4, 13, copied in Lk.<sub>m</sub>: ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, καὶ καταλιπὼν τὴν Ναζαρά ἐλθὼν κατῴκησεν εἰς Καφαρναούμ. Jesus was at Nazareth before he was at Capernaum.

Lk. struck out the words that follow Γαλιλαίαν, and inserted instead an actual account of Jesus preaching at Nazareth, followed by καὶ κατῆλθεν εἰς Καφαρναούμ.

<sup>1</sup> See Chapter II. § 3.

The Nazareth episode, in Lk.<sub>m</sub>, followed the B-piece on the Ruler's daughter, to which, as we have seen (pp. 81, 85, 107) there clung the Matthaean words *καὶ φήμη ἐξῆλθεν καθ' ὅλης τῆς περιχώρου περὶ αὐτοῦ· καὶ αὐτὸς ἐδίδασκεν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν, δοξαζόμενος ὑπὸ πάντων.*

These words, then, stand immediately before the Nazareth notice, to which they form an admirable introduction, and they are transferred along with it to the new context.

## CONCLUSION

A sufficient example of the application of my hypothesis has now been given to illustrate the way in which it works.

I submit that

(1) It explains the extent and nature of the coincidences of Mt. and Lk. against Mk in the Triple Tradition better than any other theory. [Neither Corrected Mark nor the chance outcome of a common literary habit will explain, for instance, the fact that Lk. writes δέ, against καί in Mk, in every case where Mt. uses a dating phrase (τότε, ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ, ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος or the like), sixteen in all. So far as I can see, only two hypotheses will explain it: (1) that some fine literary sense in Mt. and also in Lk. led to the selection of all these sixteen καί's in Mk for displacement by some other word, and that in each case Mt. felt impelled to supply a date, and Lk. a δέ; (2) that Lk. was acquainted with Mt. or Mt. with Lk. And of these two explanations the former involves, beyond all measure, the greater improbability. No other hypothesis will explain the fact that εἶπεν, εἶπαν occurs in corresponding places in Mt. and Lk. in the Triple Tradition not only more often, but *proportionately* more often, than in corresponding places in Lk. and Mk. (Lk. accepts εἶπεν from Mk seventeen times out

of twenty-six occurrences. In Mt. there are forty-eight occurrences, and thirty-six coincidences with Lk.) "Corrected Mk" will not explain why Lk. prefers this word when introduced by the Corrector to the same word when used by Mk, and allowed by the Corrector to stand. Nor will an appeal to chance explain it: rather such an appeal will raise this fact to the marvellous. The fact however is there to be explained; and I humbly submit that it is not disposed of by decreeing that the criticism which calls attention to it shall be considered unsound.]

(2) My hypothesis explains, quite as well as the Q theory, the presence in Mt. and Lk. of so much common non-Marcan matter.

(3) It explains, as the Q theory cannot explain, the phenomena of order in which this matter appears in Mt. and Lk.: both those of agreement in order, and those of variation in order.

(4) It explains, as no other hypothesis yet put forward can explain, the disposition of this matter with relation to the Marcan matter in Lk. To take, for instance, the last fact mentioned in my exposition of Lk.'s work, the present state of Lk. 4, 14-17. This is seen to grow most naturally out of the conditions of Lk.'s work, as my hypothesis conceives them. I do not know how else it can be explained.

(5) It explains, *en passant*, many little features in the text of Lk. which, on any other theory, remain unexplained. These are to be found *passim* in my exposition.



## APPENDIX I

### COMPARISON OF THE A- AND B-PIECES IN LUKE

The A-pieces consist of the notices of the healing of Peter's wife's mother, the cleansing of a leper and curing of a paralytic, and the disputes about fasting and the Sabbath. So far as these are parallel both to Mt. and to original Mk they comprise: Lk. 4, 38, 39; 5, 12-14, 18-20*a*, 24*b*, 25; and 5, 33-6, 11.

The B-pieces consist of the stilling of the storm, the demoniac and the swine, and the healing of the ruler's daughter with the episode of the *γυνὴ αἰμορροοῦσα*. Roughly speaking they comprise: Lk. 8, 22-37*a*, and 8, 41-56.

On my theory the A-pieces were taken by Lk. from Mk, and afterwards retouched with the help of Mt.; the B-pieces were taken by Lk. from Mt. and afterwards very considerably altered and extended in the light of Mk's version. On any other theory all these pieces are simply pieces of Lk. whose sole source was Mk, and their coincidences with Mt. are all to be explained in the same way—by "Corrected Mark," or accidental similarity of style between Mt. and Lk.: that is to say, the pieces are homo-

geneous. Therefore any marked differences in the relation of the Lucan A- and B-pieces to the text either of Mk or of Mt. will tell against every other theory, and in favour of my own hypothesis.

(1) For the purpose of my first test only one B-piece (the storm) can be utilised. In both of the others Mk's narrative is very much longer and fuller than that of Mt.; Lk. also rejects the duplication in Mt. 8, 28 sqq., so that his notices were reconstructed on the basis of Mk, and it is difficult to detach pieces which are parallel to both Mt. and Mk.

In the following passages from Lk. (WH text) words (or parts of words) or phrases which are common to Lk. and Mk only are shown thus: συναγωγῆς; those which are common to Lk. and Mt. only are shown thus: ἰδοῦ; those which are common to Lk., Mt. and Mk are shown thus: οἰκίαν.

#### A-pieces:

Lk. 4, 38 sq.: ἀναστὰς δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς συναγωγῆς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος. πενθερὰ ■ τοῦ Σίμωνος ἦν συνεχομένη πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ, καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν περὶ αὐτῆς. καὶ ἐπιστὰς ἐπάνω αὐτῆς ἐπετίμησεν τῷ πυρετῷ, καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτήν· παραχρῆμα δὲ ἀναστᾶσα διηκόνει αὐτοῖς.

Lk. 5, 12 sqq.: καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐν μιᾷ τῶν πόλεων καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ πλήρης λέπρας· ἰδὼν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν πεσὼν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ἐδεήθη αὐτοῦ λέγων Κύριε, ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασαι με καθарίσαι. καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἤψατο αὐτοῦ λέγων Θέλω, καθарίσθητι. καὶ εὐθέως ἡ λέπρα ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸς παρήγγειλεν αὐτῷ

μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν, Ἄλλα ἀπελθὼν δείξον σεαυτὸν τῷ ἱερεῖ, καὶ προσένεγκε περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ σου καθὼς προσέταξεν Μωσῆς εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς.

Lk. 5, 18 sqq.: καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες φέροντες ἐπὶ κλίνης ἄνθρωπον ὃς ἦν παραλελυμένος, καὶ ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν εἰσενεγκεῖν καὶ θείναι αὐτὸν ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ. καὶ μὴ εὐρόντες ποίας εἰσενέγκωσιν αὐτὸν διὰ τὸν ὄχλον ἀναβάντες ἐπὶ τὸ δῶμα διὰ τῶν κεράμων καθήκαν αὐτὸν σὺν τῷ κλινιδίῳ εἰς τὸ μέσον ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. καὶ ἰδὼν τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν εἶπεν.

Lk. 5, 24b: τῷ παραλελυμένῳ Σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε καὶ ἄρας τὸ κλινιδίόν σου πορεύου εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου. καὶ παραχρῆμα ἀναστὰς ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν ἄρας ἐφ' ὃ κατέκειτο ἀπήλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ δοξάζων τὸν θεόν.

B-piece :

Lk. 8, 22 sqq.: ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν καὶ αὐτὸς ἐνέβη εἰς πλοῖον καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς Διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς λίμνης, καὶ ἀνήχθησαν. πλεόντων δὲ αὐτῶν ἀφύπνωσεν. καὶ κατέβη λαῖλαψ ἀνέμου εἰς τὴν λίμνην, καὶ συνεπληροῦντο καὶ ἐκινδύνευον· προσελθόντες δὲ διήγειραν αὐτὸν λέγοντες Ἐπιστάτα, ἐπιστάτα, ἀπολλύμεθα· ὁ δὲ διεγερθεὶς ἐπετίμησεν τῷ ἀνέμῳ καὶ τῷ κλύδωνι τοῦ ὕδατος, καὶ ἐπαύσαντο, καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη. εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς Ποῦ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν; φοβηθέντες δὲ ἐθαύμασαν, λέγοντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους Τίς ἄρα οὗτός ἐστιν ὅτι καὶ τοῖς ἀνέμοις ἐπιτάσσει καὶ τῷ ὕδατι, καὶ ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ;

The A-pieces contain 193 words, of which twenty-seven

are common (in whole or part) to Lk. and Mk only, and twelve to Lk. and Mt. only.

The B-piece contains ninety-four words, of which fifteen are common to Lk. and Mk.

In proportion to length therefore we should expect about six words in the B-piece to be common to Mt. and Lk., but not Mk ( $193:94 = 12$ : between five and six). Or if we regarded the proportion of Marcan to Matthaean words we should expect about the same number, six or seven ( $27:12 = 15:6\frac{2}{3}$ ). Instead of six Matthaean words we find eighteen—nearly three times as many as the view that A- and B-pieces are homogeneous would lead us to expect.

This fact would be more decisively significant of a direct influence of Mt. on the Lucan text if the area of comparison were larger. As it is, we can at least say that it is *consistent* with my hypothesis.

(2) A second test, referring to *Marcan* matter in the A- and B-pieces, may be applied more generally. Certain verses in Mk, 5, 3-6, 8-10, 15, 16, 29-33, 35-37, 42*b*, 43, are without parallel in Mt.; these must be left out of account (as well as the verses regarded as secondary, Mk 5, 18-20, 21, 26, 34*d*), but all the rest of Mk, 4, 35-5, 43, is counted in. So also in the A-pieces all except the secondary verses comes under notice, to wit Mk 1, 29, 30, 40-44; 2, 3-5*a*; 2, 11-12*a*; 2, 18*b*-3, 6.

The test consists in detecting in Lk. phrases of three consecutive words at least which occur identically in Mk. On the ordinary theory we shall expect such phrases to be proportionately about equally numerous, and jointly to include relatively the same number of words, in the A- and the B-pieces.

The A-pieces in Lk. contain the following :

- Mk 1, 29 εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος.  
 1, 30 περὶ αὐτῆς. καί.  
 καὶ ἀφήκεν αὐτήν.  
 1, 40 ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασθαί με καθαρῖσαι.  
 1, 41 ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα.  
 θέλω, καθαρῖσθητι. καί.  
 1, 44 τῷ ἱερεῖ, καὶ προσένεγκε περὶ τοῦ καθα-  
 ρισμοῦ σου.  
 προσέταξεν Μωυσῆς εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς.  
 2, 4 διὰ τὸν ὄχλον.  
 2, 5 τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν.  
 2, 11 σοὶ λέγω, Ἐγείρε.  
 εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου· καί.  
 2, 18<sup>b</sup> οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου.  
 οἱ δὲ σοί.  
 2, 19 τοῦ νυμφῶνος ἐν ᾧ ὁ νυμφίος μετ' αὐτῶν  
 ἐστίν.  
 2, 20 ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι.  
 ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος.  
 τότε νηστεύουσιν ἐν.  
 2, 21 ἐπὶ ἱμάτιον παλαιόν· εἰ δέ.  
 2, 22 καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκούς  
 παλαιούς· εἰ δέ.  
 ῥήξει ὁ οἶνος.  
 τοὺς ἀσκούς, καί.  
 καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί.  
 ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκούς καινούς.  
 2, 23 οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.  
 2, 24 ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν.  
 2, 25 ἐποίησεν Δαυεὶδ ὅτε.  
 ἐπείνασεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ.  
 2, 26 εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ.

- καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως.  
οὗς οὐκ ἔξεστιν φαγεῖν εἰ μή.  
2, 27 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς.  
ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.  
3, 3 εἰς τὸ μέσον. καί.  
3, 5 ἔκτεινον τὴν χεῖρά σου.  
καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ.

There are thirty-six such phrases, including 157 words.

The B-pieces in Lk. contain the following:

- Mk 4, 35 διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πέραν.  
4, 39 διεγερθεὶς ἐπετίμησεν τῷ ἀνέμῳ καί.  
καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη.  
4, 41 πρὸς ἀλλήλους Τίς ἄρα οὗτός ἐστιν ὅτι καί.  
5, 1 εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γερασηνῶν.  
5, 7 τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ  
ὑψίστου.  
μή με βασανίσῃς.  
5, 12 καὶ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτόν.  
5, 13 καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν αὐτοῖς.  
εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τοὺς χοίρους καὶ ὥρμησεν ἡ  
ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ εἰς τήν.  
5, 14 ἔφυγον καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ  
εἰς τοὺς ἀγρούς.  
5, 25 καὶ γυνὴ οὖσα ἐν ρύσει αἵματος.  
5, 27 τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ.  
5, 34 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῇ Θυγάτηρ, ἡ πίστις σου  
σέσωκέν σε.  
5, 39 ἀπέθανεν, ἀλλὰ καθεύδει.  
5, 40 καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ.  
καὶ τὴν μητέρα.  
5, 41 κρατήσας τῆς χειρός.

Here are eighteen such phrases, containing 102 words.

In the A-pieces in Mk we find about 489 words, in the B-pieces about 459 words. Proportionately the B-pieces should yield about thirty-three phrases, and 147 words. The defect of Marcan language in the B-pieces is great enough to be noteworthy, if not significant; especially when we remember that even on my hypothesis a certain number of Marcan phrases would be sure to reach Lk. by way of Mt. (apparently, in this actual case, about twenty-eight words). The result of this test is again rather in favour of my hypothesis than against it.

(3) Two further tests, of a more cogent character, though they are not of a statistical kind, will now follow. The first has reference to the character of the Matthaean touches in the A- and in the B-pieces.

In the first of the A-pieces, the *πενθερὰ Σίμωνος*, we have already seen how the word *συνεχομένη* came to be used by Lk. (p. 61 above). There seems to be no other coincidence with Mt. here.

The rest of the Matthaean touches in the A-pieces are exactly of the kind that we should expect to find if a text already written and complete on the basis of one source were afterwards compared with a slightly different, and in some respects a somewhat better, version of the same matter. Most of them consist in the insertion or substitution of a single word: *ιδού* for *ἔρχεται* and *Κύριε* in Lk. 5, 12, *ιδού* for *ἔρχονται* in Lk. 5, 18, *εἶπεν* for *λέγει* in Lk. 5, 20, 22, 31; 6, 3, and *εἶπαν* for *ἔλεγον* Lk. 6, 2, *καί* (perhaps) Lk. 5, 21, a *πρός* that may be occasioned by Mt.'s *προσ-έρχονται* Lk. 5, 33, *-γε* added to *μή* Lk. 5, 37, *βλητέον* added at the end of a complete Marcan phrase Lk. 5, 38, *μόνους* Lk. 6, 4, *τήν* Lk. 6, 6; others do not even extend



to the whole of a word: κλινίδιον displaces κράβαττον (i.e. -λινιδι- displaces -ραβαττ-) Lk. 5, 24, in the same way -βαλλ- displaces -ραπτ- in ἐπιράπτει Lk. 5, 36; almost as slight (from a scribe's point of view) are the changes: λέγων for καὶ λέγει Lk. 5, 13, the addition of ἐπὶ κλίνης Lk. 5, 18, εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς (for καὶ λέγει, on occasion of ὁ δὲ εἶπεν) Lk. 6, 9.

Only three remain. One of these consists in the insertion of a single word. Lk. had written at 5, 37 καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπολούνται, which gives the sense of Mk. Mt.'s ἐκχεῖται reminds him that the wine is not really destroyed, but spilt: so he brings the word ἐκχυθήσεται between αὐτός and καί (using a caret sign, one may suppose). At 6, 1 he had written, following Mk, ἔτιλλον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ τοὺς στάχυνας: Mt.'s καὶ ἐσθίειν induces Lk. to insert καὶ ἥσθιον before τ. σταχ., and to make clear in what sense the disciples "ate ears of corn" he adds in his margin ψάχοντες ταῖς χερσίν. The third and last of these cases is more interesting. Mk.'s notice of the paralytic ended with ἐξῆλθεν ἔμπροσθεν πάντων. Lk. has already used the last two words (as ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν) with better effect after ἀναστάς—for surely the moment of the man's uprising would be that which would draw all eyes to him—so Lk.'s version ends with ἐξῆλθεν. In Mt., when he reaches the place, Lk. finds ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ. This is not only pleasant in itself, but it shows that the man whom Jesus had healed obeyed his command. Lk. therefore changes ἐξ- to ἀπ- and adds four words.

This part of Lk.'s copy of Mt. was, as we have found reason to suspect (p. 79), worn and hard to decipher. Lk. is able to read at best the letters -φοβ- in ἐφοβήθησαν, and these are enough to suggest a meaning. Next comes

an all but illegible piece containing the letters *δοξασ-ν-ον*. Lk. seems to have been in doubt about the letter before the *δ*. Was it *ε* or *α*? If *ε*, he would read *ἐδόξασεν*, and *τὸν θεόν* follows of course. If *α*, then *-αδοξα* suggests *παράδοξα*, which again gives a good meaning. "They were filled with fear, because they had seen such *παράδοξα*." Then the *σ* following must begin a word. Taking the worn N for a worn M, Lk. easily fills out *σ-μ—ον* into *σήμερον*. Since both interpretations of his difficult text are good and natural, and he cannot decide between them, Lk. adopts both, so that he writes, after *οἶκον αὐτοῦ*: *δοξάζων τὸν θεόν. καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν φόβου λέγοντες [ὅτι?] εἶδαμεν παράδοξα σήμερον*.

At the revision however he saw reason to alter this wording. When read connectedly and alone it seems to imply that though the paralytic himself glorified God for the gift of health, the spectators were filled with terror at the marvel. To correct this he erases (as he thinks, sufficiently) all that follows *αὐτοῦ*, and writes instead *καὶ ἔκστασις ἔλαβεν ἅπαντας καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν θεόν*.

By mishap the rejected but still legible phrases of Lk.<sub>m</sub> were copied out by the scribe who made the first published copy of Lk., as well as the revisionary addition. Hence the strange pleonasm and the un-Lucan procession of *καί*-phrases in our canonical gospel. Hence also the form of the interpolation in Mk, which combines both the forms in Lk., though it <sup>omits</sup> suits the reference to fear and avoids the word *παράδοξα*.

[*ἔκστασις* is late Lucan, occurring four times in Acts, but not recurring in the gospel. In the inorganic phrase Mk 5, 42 it is probably secondary to Lk., and in Mk 16, 8 (om. Old Syriac) secondary to Mt. The revisionary piece

in Lk. here is omitted by D and the Old Latin (apparently), which follow Lk.<sub>m</sub>.]

In the A-pieces, then, the Matthaean touches in Lk. are of an adscititious sort. The only extensive addition comes at the end of a section, where it could more conveniently be written. All the rest are of a kind that can be made in a completed text, without re-writing. In the B-pieces, on the other hand, the relation of the Matthaean to the Marcan matter in Lk. is reversed. Here the Matthaean words are such as record facts not mentioned in Mk, yet not in themselves of a striking character, or are the basis of the sentence, or in some other way reveal themselves as being part of the original text; while many of the Marcan words are such as could easily have been inserted in a writing already complete. The chief instances are: the embarkation of Jesus and his disciples in a boat, Lk. 8, 22 from Mt. 8, 23 (Mk's rather striking and quite innocent phrase *παραλαμβάνουσιν αὐτὸν ὡς ἦν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ* is not adopted; it is surely inconceivable that Lk. would have struck this out, if it had already stood in his text, and substituted the colourless phrase from Mt.); the *προσελθόντες* [*δι*]ῆγειραν, Lk. 8, 24 from Mt. 8, 25, where Mk has only *ἐγείρουσιν* (the prefix *δι-* is inserted, here and later in the verse, on occasion of Mk 4, 39); *ἐθαύμασαν λέγοντες*, Lk. 8, 25 from Mt. 8, 27, where it is the substitute for Mk's *ἐφοβήθησαν* (Lk.'s *φοβηθέντες* is inserted on occasion of this word); the use of *δαιμόνια* (Mt.'s *δαίμονες*) in Lk. 8, 26 sqq., where Mk has only *ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ* and *τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα*; the state of Lk. 8, 41, where Lk. had written *ἄρχων* with Mt. 9, 18, but found in Mk *ἀρχισυναγώγων*, and therefore

inserted τῆς συναγωγῆς; and προσελθοῦσα ὀπισθεν ἤψατο τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ, exactly Matthæan, at Lk. 8, 44 (Mk reads ἐλθοῦσα ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ ὀπισθεν ἤψατο τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ). Even the use of οἰκίαν at Lk. 8, 51 (= Mt. 9, 23; Mk 5, 38 reads οἶκον) is significant, for everywhere else where Mk has οἶκος or οἰκία Lk. adopts the Marcan word: here it was not worth his while to alter the text which he already had. Similarly the αὐτῆς of Lk. 8, 54 is a little sign of the priority of Mt., since Mk's τοῦ παιδίου is objectionable, and would hardly have been rejected if it had been first met with.

Some other signs of the adscititious character of the Marcan matter in the B-pieces are a little more subtle. In Lk. 8, 22 ἀνήχθησαν is very doubtfully grammatical: Lk. never uses ἀνάγεσθαι without ἀπό, εἰς or ἐκεῖθεν, except at Acts 28, 10 ἀναγομένοις, "as we were sailing," and 28, 11 ἀνήχθημεν ἐν πλοίῳ, which are both justified by the resumptive καταχθέντες εἰς Συρακούσας of 28, 12. Lk. probably wrote in 8, 22, after οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, "καὶ ἀνήχθησαν εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς λίμνης." When he came to the Marcan version, and adopted καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς Διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς λίμνης, this phrase displaced the other. καὶ ἀνήχθησαν is omitted by the Syriac versions, and was probably absent from Lk.<sub>m</sub>. Its presence in canonical Lk. may be due to the stupidity of the same scribe to whom we owe the present state of Lk. 5, 26, namely, the man who made the fair copy of revised Lk. for the publishers. (It must be remembered that erased writing grows more legible after a time, and also that, as we have seen, Lk. seems to have used the original autograph of Lk.<sub>m</sub> in his revision.)

At Lk. 8, 23 εἰς τὴν λίμνην represents the ἐν τῇ

θαλάσση of Mt., and the prefix in κατέβη depends on this phrase.

Lk. 8, 24<sup>b</sup> has the affirmative form of Mt., not the interrogative of Mk, and ἐπιστάτα is so little likely to represent Mk's διδάσκαλε that Dr A. Wright (*Synopsis, ad loc.*) suggests "that the proto-Mark read 'Ραββεί in 4, 38<sup>d</sup>." (At Lk. 9, 33 the word represents 'Ραββεί in Mk, Κύριε in Mt.; at Lk. 9, 49 it now stands for διδάσκαλε in Mk, but the reading of Lk.<sub>m</sub>, if D may be taken to have preserved it, was also διδάσκαλε.) In this place Lk.<sub>m</sub> seems to have read Κύριε with Mt. (so D).

Lk. 8, 24<sup>c</sup> has also the form of Mt. (D even reads ἐγερθείς. If this is right the assimilation to διήγειραν came in at the revision) in that καὶ τῷ κλύδωνι (with or without τοῦ ὕδατος, om. D) represents καὶ τῇ θαλάσση, not καὶ εἶπεν πεφίμωσο.

In Lk. 8, 24<sup>d</sup> καὶ ἐπαύσαντο certainly looks like an insertion to represent Mk's καὶ ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἄνεμος, but it is omitted by Old Syriac and Old Latin codices, and may be a revisionary touch. In any case the remaining phrase is Matthaean, the μεγάλη of Mk not being added.

In Lk. 8, 25 πρὸς ἀλλήλους (if genuine; om. **Σ**) is an adscititious insertion from Mk, after the ἐθαύμασαν λέγοντες of Mt. The plural in ἀνέμοις and ὑπακούουσιν comes from Mt.

In this section the omissions from Mk by Lk. are most noteworthy. Everything that is characteristic of Mk's notice is omitted: ἦν ἐν τῇ πρύμνῃ ἐπὶ τὸ προσκεφάλαιον καθεύδων—οὐ μέλει σοι;—Σιώπα, πεφίμωσο.

In the story of the demoniac and the swine, in spite

of its rejection of Mt.'s duplication, and its expansion from Mk, there are still certain signs, beyond obvious coincidences, that point to its Matthaean origin. *ικανῶν* in Lk. 8, 32 = *πολλῶν* Mt. 8, 30, and in the same verse *παρεκάλουν* ought probably to be read, with **8**, D and Old Latin codices. "Western" readings show a nearer likeness to Mt. than B exhibits, e.g. Lk. 8, 26 *Γαδαρηνῶν*; 8, 27 *μνημείοις*; 8, 28 *ἀνέκραξεν τί ἐμοί κ.τ.λ.* (probably; D is confused).

And we have already observed the significance of *αὐτὸς δὲ ἐμβάς κ.τ.λ.* in Lk. 8, 37 (pp. 78 sq., 104—106 above).

In the ruler's daughter, Lk. 8, 42, *ἀπέθνησκειν* looks like the softening, in the light of Mk's *ἐσχάτως ἔχει*, of a word equivalent to Mt.'s *ἐτελεύτησεν*. At Lk. 8, 46, *ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς*, embedded in a purely Marcan passage, looks like a survival of that phrase of Mt.—three out of seven words that take the place of several verses of Mk. But here also the reconstruction, to embody the new Marcan matter, has obliterated all but a few signs of the Matthaean origin of the section. Such as remain however are in part very striking—e.g. Lk. 8, 44.

(4) The last test has reference to the order of the members in each of the A and B sections in Lk.

In the A-pieces Lk.'s order is simply that of Mk, and there is no more to be said. (Lk. 5, 20b—24a is inserted in the Marcan narrative exactly where it comes in Mt., and does not affect what precedes or follows.)

But in the B-pieces several traces of the original Matthaean order survive, to the disturbance of that of Mk. In the storm notice Lk. follows Mk in transposing

Mt.'s order in the stilling of the tempest and the rebuke to the disciples (this may account for the brevity of the rebuke in Lk.; it is reduced to seven short words, which can be written between two lines of script). But the embarkation, which stood first in Lk.'s transcript from Mt., still precedes the first notice adopted from Mk; and the *πλεόντων δὲ αὐτῶν ἀφύπνωσεν*, which Mt.'s *αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκάθευδεν* had led Lk. to introduce rather earlier, before the storm began, still holds that place; so that there is no real parallel in Lk. to Mk 4, 38*a*.

In the story of the demoniac and the swine Lk. had naturally followed Mt. 8, 28, 29 in the beginning of his own notice, Lk. 8, 26-29. The passage which Mk interposes between the matter of Mt. 8, 28 and 8, 29 could not be conveniently introduced into this connected piece; so it is added at the end of it, along with the new Marcan matter that *follows* this part of the narrative. By means of this device Lk. is able to transfer a manipulable piece of his script, write in the next column, or underneath, all the new matter of both Marcan pieces at once, and then fasten on another considerable piece of his completed script. (The changes and additions which he makes in the Matthaean transcript are slight enough to be effected by erasure and insertion between lines.) This last bit of manuscript, when fastened in its new place in the roll, can be expanded by matter added at the side on the clean papyrus. Lk. did not manage this last addition with much art. He had written: *ἐξῆλθον δὲ πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ ἠρώτησαν* (D) *αὐτόν κ.τ.λ.*, or some such clause. Near the beginning he inserts between lines: *ἰδεῖν τὸ γεγονός καὶ ἦλθαν*, and then at the side: *καὶ εὗραν...ὁ δαίμονισθείς*



(Lk. 8, 35*b*, 36), with the result that we have three *καί*-clauses in clumsy succession.

In the ruler's daughter the whole of Lk. 8, 44*b* *καὶ παραχρῆμα*—8, 51 was evidently written in the same way at the side of a piece of transferred writing. (Only about a score of words needed erasure in Lk.'s Matthaean transcript.) It is convenient to embody in such a single insertion as much as possible of necessary addition, and for this reason Lk. brings forward "*καὶ τὸν πατέρα τῆς παιδὸς καὶ τὴν μητέρα*" from a rather later place to the point before his resumption of Mt.—that is, to an inclusion at the end of the piece of new writing. The only other addition is made at the end of the notice (to displace the words representing Mt.'s *καὶ ἠγέρθη τὸ κοράσιον*). Perhaps it was lack of space that suggested to Lk. the removal of *ἦν γὰρ ἐτῶν δώδεκα* to an equally good context earlier, where so slight a phrase (three words in Lk.) could easily be written in. In this section, then, the variations in order are slight, but such as they are they are explained by the fact that this is a B-piece.

These four tests, considered cumulatively, tell very strongly in favour of my hypothesis.

## APPENDIX II

### LUKE'S USE OF THE PERIPHRASTIC IMPERFECT

Whatever may be the habit of other N.T. writers, in Lk. the use of ἦν or ἤμην with a present participle is definitely circumscribed, clear, consistent and distinctive. It is always used in one or other of two ways, which are well exemplified in Acts 22, 19, 20: Κύριε, αὐτοὶ ἐπίστανται ὅτι ἐγὼ ἤμην φυλακίζων καὶ δέρων κατὰ τὰς συναγωγὰς τοὺς πιστεύοντας ἐπὶ σέ· καὶ ὅτε ἐξεχύνητο τὸ αἷμα Στεφάνου τοῦ μάρτυρός σου, καὶ αὐτὸς ἤμην ἐφεστὼς καὶ συνευδοκῶν καὶ φυλάσσω τὰ ἱμάτια τῶν ἀναιρούντων αὐτόν. "I used to imprison and beat believers, and when Stephen was martyred I was standing by and taking care of the murderers' clothes." Periphrastic imperfects of the first class all relate to something continuous or habitual, to a state, usage or practice that lasted over a considerable period; those of the second class exactly correspond to the most ordinary English use of the same idiom, in which something continuous is related to something momentary, and one of the two serves to date the other. In the following analytic list all the cases are included in which the participle is a true predicate, and no others. (Such cases as ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἦν ἄνθρωπος ἔχων πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου are excluded.)

## CLASS I

A. Those which indicate a habit, practice or course of action, pursued for some time, such as we express by "used to" with the infinitive, or "was engaged in" with a gerund.

## 1. With a date of place:

Lk. 4, 44 καὶ ἦν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς τῆς Ἰουδαίας.

5, 16 αὐτὸς δὲ ἦν ὑποχωρῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις καὶ προσευχόμενος.

Acts 9, 28 καὶ ἦν μετ' αὐτῶν εἰσπορευόμενος καὶ ἐκπορευόμενος εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ.

14, 7 (κατέφυγον εἰς τὰς πόλεις τῆς Λυκαονίας...) κακεῖ εὐαγγελιζόμενοι ἦσαν.

## 2. With a general date of time:

Lk. 4, 31 καὶ ἦν διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς σάββασι.

## 3. With both dates:

Lk. 19, 47 καὶ ἦν διδάσκων τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ.

Lk. 21, 37 ἦν δὲ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων (τὰς δὲ νύκτας ἐξερχόμενος ἠϋλίζετο κ.τ.λ.)

Observe the ordinary imperfects following in the same sense, which is now fixed. So also we should say in English "He used to preach in the Metropolitan Tabernacle, and people came in crowds to hear him."

## 4. Without date:

Lk. 1, 21? See below, II B 1.

2, 51 (καὶ κατέβη μετ' αὐτῶν...) καὶ ἦν ὑποτασσόμενος αὐτοῖς.

(15, 1 ἦσαν δὲ αὐτῷ ἐγγίζοντες πάντες οἱ τελῶναι καὶ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀκούειν αὐτοῦ. Included below, II A 1.)

Acts 1, 13? See below, II B 2δ.

19, 14 ἦσαν δέ τινος Σκευᾶ Ἰουδαίου ἀρχιερέως  
ἐπὶ τὰ υἱοὶ τοῦτο ποιοῦντες (namely practising  
exorcism in the name of Jesus).

22, 19 ἐγὼ ἤμην φυλακίζων καὶ δέρων κατὰ τὰς  
συναγωγὰς τοὺς πιστεύοντας ἐπὶ σέ.

B. Those which express a continuous state or condition.

Lk. 13, 11 καὶ ἦν συγκύπτουσα καὶ μὴ δυναμένη ἀνα-  
κύψαι εἰς τὸ παντελές.

Acts 9, 9 καὶ ἦν ἡμέρας τρεῖς μὴ βλέπων.

12, 20? See below, II A 1.

C. Those in which the verb is itself expressive of some mode of continuance (apart from the tense employed).

Lk. 6, 12 καὶ ἦν διανυκτερεύων ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ τοῦ  
θεοῦ (a stronger wording of δι' ὅλης νυκτὸς  
ἦν προσευχόμενος, unless indeed προσευχή  
means a place of prayer).

Acts 1, 14 οὗτοι πάντες ἦσαν προσκαρτεροῦντες ὁμο-  
θυμαδὸν τῇ προσευχῇ.

2, 5 ἦσαν δὲ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ κατοικοῦντες Ἰου-  
δαῖοι (a doubtful case).

2, 42 ἦσαν δὲ προσκαρτεροῦντες τῇ διδαχῇ τῶν  
ἀποστόλων κ.τ.λ.

8, 13 ὁ δὲ Σίμων... ἦν προσκαρτερῶν τῷ Φιλίππῳ.

16, 12 ἡμεν δὲ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ πόλει διατρίβοντες  
ἡμέρας τινάς.

18, 7? See below, II B 2ε.

## CLASS II

A. Where the associated transaction is expressed in the words following:

1. With δέ:

Lk. 1, 10 καὶ πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος ἦν τοῦ λαοῦ προσευχόμενον ἔξω τῇ ὥρᾳ τοῦ θυμιάματος, ὥφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος Κυρίου ("While all the crowd was waiting outside he had a vision").

1, 21? See below, II B 1.

4, 20 καὶ πάντων οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἦσαν ἀτενίζοντες αὐτῷ, ἤρξατο δὲ λέγειν πρὸς αὐτοὺς κ.τ.λ.

11, 14 καὶ ἦν ἐκβάλλων δαιμόνιον κωφόν, ἐγένετο δὲ τοῦ δαιμονίου ἐξελθόντος ἐλάλησεν ὁ κωφός.

15, 1 ἦσαν δὲ αὐτῷ ἐγγίζοντες πάντες οἱ τελῶναι καὶ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀκούειν αὐτοῦ, καὶ διεγόγγυζον οἱ...Φαρισαῖοι...λέγοντες ὅτι Οὗτος ἁμαρτωλοὺς προσδέχεται..., εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην. (Here again the intervening ordinary imperfect takes its force from the periphrasis.)

Acts 8, 28 ἦν δὲ ὑποστρέφων καὶ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄρματος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀνεγίνωσκεν τὸν προφήτην Ἡσαΐαν, εἶπεν δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τῷ Φιλίππῳ Πρόσελθε κ.τ.λ. (Observe here too the ordinary imperfect used in sequence to the periphrasis.)

12, 20 ἦν δὲ θυμομαχῶν Τυρίοις καὶ Σιδωνίοις, ὁμοθυμαδὸν δὲ παρήσαν πρὸς αὐτόν. (Herod was in a state of fury against, or was medi-

tating hostilities against, the Tyrians, when they came and made overtures to him.)

2. With *καὶ ἰδοῦ*:

Lk. 5, 17 *καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν διδάσκων καὶ ἦσαν καθήμενοι Φαρισαῖοι οἱ ἦσαν ἐλληλυθότες ἐκ... Ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ δύναμις Κυρίου ἦν εἰς τὸ ἰᾶσθαι αὐτόν, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες φέροντες... ἄνθρωπον* (with two periphrastic imperfects and an *ἦν*, which does not admit of such enlargement, before the sequel thus dated).

13, 10 *ἦν δὲ διδάσκων ἐν μιᾷ τῶν συναγωγῶν τῷ σαββάτῳ καὶ ἰδοὺ γυνὴ πνεῦμα ἔχουσα ἀσθενείας.*

14, 1 *καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἐλθεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς οἶκόν τινος τῶν ἀρχόντων... καὶ αὐτοὶ ἦσαν παρατηρούμενοι αὐτόν, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπός τις ἦν ὑδρωπικὸς ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ.*

Acts 10, 30 *ἀπὸ τετάρτης ἡμέρας μέχρι ταύτης τῆς ὥρας ἤμην τὴν ἐνάτην προσευχόμενος ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ μου, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ ἕστη ἐνώπιόν μου ἐν ἐσθῇτι λαμπρᾷ.*

12, 6 *τῇ νυκτὶ ἐκείνῃ ἦν ὁ Πέτρος κοιμώμενος... φύλακές τε... ἐτήρουν τὴν φυλακὴν, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄγγελος Κυρίου ἐπέστη.*

See also Lk. 8, 40 and Acts 1, 10 below (II B 2β and II A 6), two cases where a periphrastic imperfect is in fact followed by *καὶ ἰδοῦ*, but does not appear to have been expressly written (or at least not exclusively) in order to that locution; and Lk. 2, 8 (II A 4).

3. With *καὶ ἐγένετο*:

Lk. 24, 13 *καὶ ἰδοὺ δύο ἐξ αὐτῶν... ἦσαν πορευόμενοι εἰς κώμην... ἣ ὄνομα Ἑμμαούς, καὶ αὐτοὶ ὠμίλουν*

πρὸς ἀλλήλους περὶ πάντων τῶν συμβεβηκότων τούτων, καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ὁμιλεῖν αὐτοὺς...αὐτὸς Ἰησοῦς ἐγγίσας συνεπορεύετο αὐτοῖς. (There is a very doubtful καί before αὐτός, but since neither B nor either O.S. version recognises it the καὶ ἐγένετο is probably to be taken as a conjunction, and its substitution for καὶ ἰδού in this place is to be explained (1) by the presence of καὶ ἰδού at the beginning of the clause, (2) by a wish, perhaps, to make the advent of the unrecognised Stranger as quiet in impression as possible.)

4. With simple καί? :

Lk. 2, 8? καὶ ποιμένες ἦσαν ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ τῇ αὐτῇ ἀγραυλοῦντες καὶ φυλάσσοντες (τὰς?) φυλακὰς τῆς νυκτὸς ἐπὶ τὴν ποίμνην αὐτῶν, καὶ ἄγγελος Κυρίου ἐπέστη αὐτοῖς. (This case is dubious on two counts: (1) Is not ἦσαν absolute—"there were shepherds"—or at least do we not find its complement in ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ τῇ αὐτῇ? (2) For καί before ἄγγελος D reads καὶ ἰδού.)

5, 1? ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ τὸν ὄχλον ἐπικεῖσθαι αὐτῷ...καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ἐστῶς παρὰ τὴν λίμνην Γεννησαρέτ, καὶ εἶδεν πλοῖα δύο ἐστῶτα παρὰ τὴν λίμνην. (This is another suspicious case. D reads ἐστῶτος αὐτοῦ for καὶ...ἐστῶς, which certainly removes something of the un-Lucan clumsiness of the whole clause. If we ventured to remove ἐστῶτα...λίμνην after πλοῖα δύο as an ac-



cidental repetition of the words above, some of the awkwardness would disappear without D's emendation, but even then the genitive absolute has a more probable sound.)

Acts 11, 5? *ἐγὼ ἤμην ἐν πόλει Ἰόππῃ προσευχόμενος καὶ εἶδον ἐν ἐκστάσει ὄραμα.* (Perhaps this case should be excluded on the ground that the complement of *ἤμην* is *ἐν πόλει Ἰόππῃ*. The conciseness of the context would support that view. If we admit this case and the preceding, we shall observe that the word after *καί* in each is *εἶδεν*, so that *καὶ ἰδοῦ* would hardly be possible, and even *καὶ ἐγένετο* would be grotesque. It seems that the simple *καί*, if it occurs at all as a link after the periphrastic imperfect, was at least avoided if possible.)

5. With a relative particle (*ὥς*) after the periphrasis:

Lk. 24, 32 *οὐχὶ ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν καιομένη ἦν ὥς ἐλάλει ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, ὥς διήνοιγεν ἡμῖν τὰς γραφάς;* (The period covered by *καιομένη* embraces both the following clauses, whose like relation to it is shown by repetition of the particle.)

6. With a relative particle (*ὥς*) before the periphrasis:

Acts 1, 10 *καὶ ὥς ἀτενίζοντες ἦσαν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν πορευομένου αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες δύο παρειστήκεισαν αὐτοῖς.* (This case is unique, even without the *καί* before *ἰδοῦ*, which disturbs the syntax. It is obvious to suspect that either *ὥς* or *καί* is intrusive, but perhaps the *καὶ ἰδοῦ* is an intentional

effect of sudden surprise, and perhaps we have here a real Semitism.)

B. Where the associated transaction is expressed in words preceding; the sense is often precisely that which we express by adding "meanwhile," "at the time" or (in familiar speech) "all along," to the periphrasis.

1. Without precise formulation of the associated transaction or circumstance:

Lk. 1, 21 (The crowd is mentioned as already gathered outside the temple in Lk. 1, 10; then follows the story of the vision, 1, 11-20; then) *καὶ ἦν ὁ λαὸς προσδοκῶν τὸν Ζαχαρίαν*. (This is followed by *καὶ ἐθαύμαζον ἐν τῷ χρονίζειν ἐν τῷ ναῷ αὐτόν*. *ἐξελθὼν δὲ οὐκ ἐδύνατο λαλῆσαι αὐτοῖς*, so that in form it exactly resembles the cases Lk. 8, 28, 15, 1 in II A 1 above. But here the periphrastic imperfect is motivated by what precedes, and the sequel only adapts itself to a locution already standing.)

1, 22 (In sequence to *αὐτοῖς* above) *καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν ὅτι ὀπτασίαν ἑώρακεν ἐν τῷ ναῷ· καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν διανεύων αὐτοῖς* ("and he was making signs to them all the time"—not, of course, the time merely of *ἐπέγνωσαν*, but of the whole scene, which is left to our imagination. This comes near, however, to "he continued making gestures," the force of the examples in Class I).

2, 33 *καὶ ἦν ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ θαυμάζοντες ἐπὶ τοῖς λαλουμένοις περὶ αὐτοῦ*,

namely those πάντα ῥήματα which Mary treasured and pondered in her heart, and the more recent song of Symeon. Strange things had been said about Jesus to the ever increasing wonder of his parents. This also comes near to Class I.

3, 23 καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν Ἰησοῦς ἀρχόμενος ὥσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα (at the time of the Baptism, just described in 3, 21, 22).

Acts 8, 1 Σαῦλος δὲ ἦν συνευδοκῶν τῇ ἀναιρέσει αὐτοῦ (throughout the whole procedure described in 7, 12-60).

16, 9 καὶ ὄραμα διὰ νυκτὸς τῷ Παύλῳ ὤφθη· ἀνὴρ Μακεδῶν τις ἦν ἐστὼς καὶ παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν καὶ λέγων...(the implied date is "during the vision"). See also below Acts 1, 13 (II B 2 δ).

2. Where the associated circumstance is expressly formulated in the immediately preceding words:

a. Where the periphrastic imperfect clause is attached by means of δέ:

Lk. 4, 38 εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος· πενθερὰ δὲ τοῦ Σίμωνος ἦν συνεχομένη πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ (followed by καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν περὶ αὐτῆς, but the occasion of the ἦν συνεχομένη is obviously what precedes).

Acts 10, 24 τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον ἀναστὰς ἐξῆλθεν εἰς τὴν Καισαρίαν· ὁ δὲ Κορνήλιος ἦν προσδοκῶν αὐτούς.

12, 5 ὁ μὲν οὖν Πέτρος ἐτηρεῖτο ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ· προσευχὴ δὲ ἦν ἐκτενῶς γινομένη ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας πρὸς τὸν θεὸν περὶ αὐτοῦ.

## β. Where the link is γάρ :

Lk. 8, 40 ἐν δὲ τῷ ὑποστρέφειν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπεδέξατο αὐτὸν ὁ ὄχλος, ἦσαν γὰρ πάντες προσδοκῶντες αὐτόν.

23, 8 ὁ δὲ Ἑρῳδῆς ἰδὼν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐχάρη λίαν, ἦν γὰρ ἐξ ἱκανῶν χρόνων θέλων ἰδεῖν αὐτόν.

Acts 21, 3 ? κατήλθομεν εἰς Τύρον, ἐκεῖσε γὰρ τὸ πλοῖον ἦν ἀποφορτιζόμενον τὸν γόμον (D is here unfortunately defective, so that we cannot know whether it read ἀποφορτισόμενον. In any case the meaning is a preterite-future, so that this is not quite a true case. But translating "was intending to unlade" we get a construction exactly in line with the rest).

## γ. The link is ὅτι :

Lk. 9, 53 καὶ οὐκ ἐδέξαντο αὐτόν, ὅτι τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἦν πορευόμενον εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ.

## δ. The link is an adverbial οὐ :

Lk. 23, 53 καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτὸν ἐν μνήματι λαξευτῷ οὐ οὐκ ἦν οὐδεὶς οὐπω κείμενος.

Acts 1, 13 καὶ ὅτε εἰσῆλθον, εἰς τὸ ὑπερῶν ἀνέβησαν οὐ ἦσαν καταμένοντες. (The immediate reference is to the immediately preceding words, but the imperfect covers also, perhaps, an indefinite prior period, and is so far like the cases in II B 1.)

## ε. The link is a relative pronoun :

Acts 18, 7 ἦλθεν εἰς οἰκίαν τινὸς ὀνόματι Τιτίου Ἰούστου σεβομένου τὸν θεόν, οὗ ἡ οἰκία ἦν συνομοροῦσα τῇ συναγωγῇ (whose house, as we say, was adjoining).

ζ. A relative particle (ὅτε) appears *before* the preceding clause :

Acts 22, 20 καὶ ὅτε ἐξεχύνετο τὸ αἷμα Στεφάνου τοῦ μάρτυρός σου, καὶ αὐτὸς ἤμην ἐφεστὼς καὶ συνευδοκῶν καὶ φυλάσσων τὰ ἱμάτια τῶν ἀναιρούντων αὐτόν. (The unique case is a pendant to the case at Acts 1, 10, II A 6 above. Here, however, the καί of the apodosis presents no difficulty, since it means "also." "I too was there, consenting and helping.")

It will be seen that the first class (with the continuous or frequentative force) includes 18 cases, the second (with the force of simultaneity, or dating by circumstance) includes 34 cases; 4 of the 34 are regarded on various grounds as doubtful, and 5 others (those at Lk. 1, 22, 15, 1; Acts 1, 13, 12, 20, 18, 7) are admittedly very similar to those of the first class; that is to say, while the setting relegates each case to class II, the characteristic force of class I is actually felt in the periphrasis. Thus the true ratio of frequency which class I holds to class II is about 11 : 17.

No case in class II at all resembles the case at Lk. 4, 31b, regarded as a date for Lk. 4, 33. The case quite obviously belongs to the first class.

THEOLOGY LIBRARY  
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

6859









BS2595 .L85

Lummis, Edward William, b.1867.  
How Luke was written (considering affec

6859

BS  
2595  
L85

Lummis, Edward William, b.1867.

How Luke was written (considerations affecting the document theory with special reference to the phenomenon of the non-Markan matter common to Matthew and Luke) by E. W. Lummis ... Cambridge [Eng.] The University Press, 1915.

vii, (1), 141 p. 191<sup>cm</sup>.

1. Bible. N. T. Luke—Criticism, interpretation, etc.  
I. Title.

16-3932 Revised

Library of Congress

BS2595.L8 CCSC/sk

(r43b2)

6859

